

THE
MISCELLANEOUS WORKS
OF THE
REV. JOHN WESLEY.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

CONTAINING.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN, AND TRACTS ON
VARIOUS SUBJECTS OF POLEMICAL DIVINITY.

New-York.

PRINTED AND SOLD BY J. & J. HARPER.
NO. 82 CLIFF-STREET.

1828.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IX.

	PAGE
I. <i>A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Conyers Middleton, occasioned by his late “Free Inquiry”</i>	1
II. <i>A Letter to Dr. Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, occasioned by his Tract “On the Office and Operations of the Holy Spirit”</i>	67
III. <i>A Letter to a Person lately joined with the People called Quakers, in answer to a Letter written by him</i>	110
IV. <i>An Extract of a Letter to the Rev. Mr. Law, occasioned by some of his Writings</i>	118
V. <i>A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Toogood, of Exeter; occasioned by his “Dissent from the Church of England fully justified”</i>	151
VI. <i>A Treatise on Baptism</i>	155
VII. <i>The Doctrine of Original Sin, according to Scripture, Reason, and Experience—The Preface</i>	166
PART I. SECTION 1. <i>The Past State of Mankind considered</i>	168
SECT. 2. <i>The Present State of Mankind investigated</i>	178
PART II. SECT. 1. <i>The Scriptural Method of accounting for the total Degeneracy of the Human Race</i>	200
SECT. 2. <i>The Scriptures examined which support the Doctrine of Original Sin</i>	218
SECT. 3 <i>Dr. Taylor’s Answer to some Objections and Questions, examined</i>	239
PART III. <i>An Answer to Dr. Taylor’s Supplement</i>	259
SECT. 1. <i>Of imputed Guilt</i>	260
SECT. 2. <i>Of the Nature and Design of our Afflictions and Mortality</i>	262
SECT. 3. <i>The Arguments taken from the Calamities and Sinfulness of Mankind, considered</i>	264
SECT. 4. <i>Some Consequences of the Doctrine of Original Sin</i>	269
SECT. 5. <i>A general Argument taken from God’s declarations concerning Mankind after the Deluge</i>	270
SECT. 6. <i>The Doctrine of Adam’s being a Federal Head, or Representative of Mankind, considered</i>	273
SECT. 7. <i>Of the Formation of our Nature in the Womb</i>	275
SECT. 8. <i>Of Original Righteousness</i>	278
PART IV. <i>Extracts from Dr. Watts and Mr. Hebdon</i>	289

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
<i>An Answer to Question 1, "Is Man, in his present circumstances, such a Creature as he came out of the hands of his Creator?"</i>	292
<i>Question 2, "How came Vice and Misery to overspread Mankind in all Nations and Ages?"</i>	308
SECT. 1. <i>A general Survey of the Follies and Miseries of Mankind</i>	312
SECT. 2. <i>A particular View of the Miseries of Man</i>	313
SECT. 3. <i>Objections answered</i>	316
SECT. 4. <i>The Apostacy of Man proved by Scripture and Reason</i>	318
<i>A plain Explication of the Doctrine of Imputed Sin and Imputed Righteousness</i>	320
PART V. <i>Ecclesiastes vii. 29, illustrated</i>	324
<i>Genesis ii. 16, 17, ditto</i>	327
<i>John iii. 5, 6, ditto</i>	329
<i>The Scripture Doctrine of Imputed Sin and Righteousness</i>	333
PART VI. <i>The Doctrine of Original Sin explained and vindicated</i>	338
PART VII. <i>Extract from Mr. Boston's Four-fold State of Man</i>	352
VIII. <i>Predestination calmly considered</i>	377
IX. <i>The Scripture Doctrine concerning Predestination, Election, and Reprobation</i>	420
X. <i>A Dialogue between a Predestinarian and his Friend</i>	430
XI. <i>The Consequence Proved</i>	435
XII. <i>Serious Thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints</i>	439
XIII. <i>Thoughts upon the Imputed Righteousness of Christ</i>	450
XIV. <i>A Blow at the Root; or, Christ Stabbed in the House of his Friends</i>	453
XV. <i>Thoughts upon Necessity</i>	457
XVI. <i>Thoughts upon God's Sovereignty</i>	471
XVII. <i>The Question, "What is an Arminian?" answered</i>	473
XVIII. <i>Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's Review of all the Doctrines taught by Mr. John Wesley</i>	476
XIX. <i>Some Thoughts on Mr. Hill's Farrago double-distilled</i>	507
XX. <i>A Letter to a Roman Catholic</i>	531

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

A LETTER

TO THE

REV. DR. CONYERS MIDDLETON,

OCCASIONED BY HIS LATE FREE INQUIRY.

January 4, 1748-9.

REV. SIR,

1. IN your late *Inquiry*, you endeavour to prove, first, That there were no miracles wrought in the primitive church; secondly, That all the primitive Fathers were fools or knaves, and most of them both one and the other. And it is easy to observe, the whole tenor of your argument tends to prove, thirdly, That no miracles were wrought by Christ or his apostles; and, fourthly, That those too were fools or knaves, or both.

2. I am not agreed with you on any of these heads. My reasons I shall lay before you, in as free a manner (though not in so smooth or laboured language) as you have laid yours before the world.

3. But I have neither inclination nor leisure to follow you step by step through three hundred and seventy-three quarto pages. I shall therefore set aside all I find in your work which does not touch the merits of the cause: and likewise contract the question itself to the three first centuries. For I have no more to do with the writers of miracles of the fourth, than with those of the fourteenth century.

4. You will naturally ask, ‘Why do you stop there? What reason can you give for this? If you allow miracles before the empire became Christian, why not afterwards too? I answer, because, “After the empire became Christian,” (they are your own words,) “a general corruption both of faith and morals infected the Christian church: which by that revolution, as St. Jerome says, ‘lost as much of its virtue, as it had gained of wealth and power,’” (p. 123.) And this very reason St. Chrysostom himself gave in the words you have afterwards cited; ‘There are some who ask, Why are not miracles performed still? Why are there no persons who raise the dead, and cure diseases?’ To which he replies, ‘That it was owing to the want of faith, and virtue, and piety in those times.’

1. You begin your preface by observing, that "the inquiry was intended to have been published" some time ago; but upon reflection, you resolved to "give out first some sketch of what you were projecting:" (preface, p. 1) and accordingly, "published the introductory discourse" by itself, though "foreseeing it would encounter all the opposition that prejudice, bigotry, and superstition, are ever prepared to give to all inquiries" (p. 2) of this nature. But it was your "comfort, that this would excite candid inquirers to weigh the merit and consequences of it," p. 3.

2. The consequences of it are tolerably plain, even to free the good people of England from all that "prejudice, bigotry, and superstition," vulgarly called Christianity. But it is not so plain, that "this is the sole expedient which can secure the Protestant religion against the efforts of Rome," (ibid.) It may be doubted, whether Deism is the *sole expedient* to secure us against Popery. For some are of opinion, there are persons in the world who are neither Deists nor Papists.

3. You open the cause artfully enough, by a quotation from Mr. Locke, (p. 4.) But we are agreed to build our faith on no man's authority. His reasons will be considered in their place.

"Those who have written against his and your opinion," you say, "have shown great eagerness, but little knowledge of the question: urged by the hopes of honours, and prepared to fight for every establishment, that offers such pay to its defenders," (p. 5.) I have not read one of these: yet I would fain believe, that neither the hope of honour, nor the desire of pay, was the sole or indeed the main motive that urged either them or you to engage in writing.

But I grant, they are overseen, if they argue against you, by citing "the testimonies of the ancient Fathers:" (p. 6.) seeing they might easily perceive you pay no more regard to these than to the evangelists or apostles. Neither do I commend them if they "insinuate jealousies of consequences dangerous to Christianity," (ibid.) Why they should insinuate these, I cannot conceive: I need not insinuate that the sun shines at noonday. You have "opened too great a glare to the public," (p. 7,) to leave them any room for such insinuation. Though (to save appearances) you gravely declare still, "Were my argument allowed to be true, the credit of the gospel-miracles could not in any degree be shaken by it," p. 6.

4. So far is flourish. Now we come to the point. "The present question," you say, "depends on the joint credibility of the facts, and of the witnesses who attest them, especially on the former. For if the facts be incredible, no testimony can alter the nature of things," (p. 9.) All this is most true. You go on, "The credibility of facts lies open to the trial of our reason and senses. But the credibility of witnesses depends on a variety of principles wholly concealed from us. And though in many cases it may reasonably be presumed, yet in none can it be certainly known," (p. 10.) Sir, will you retract this or defend it? If you defend, and can prove, as well as assert it, then farewell the credit of all history, not

only sacred, but profane. If “the credibility of witnesses” (of all witnesses, for you make no distinction) depends, as you peremptorily affirm, on a variety of principles “wholly concealed from us:” and consequently, though it may be presumed in many cases, yet can be certainly known in none: then it is plain, all the history of the Bible is utterly precarious and uncertain: then I may indeed “presume,” but cannot “certainly know,” that Jesus of Nazareth ever was born; much less that he healed the sick, and raised either Lazarus or himself from the dead. Now, Sir, go and declare again, how careful you are for “the credit of the gospel-miracles!”

5. But for fear any, considering how “frank and open” your nature is, and how “warmly disposed to speak what you take to be true,” (p. 7,) should fancy you meant what you said in this declaration, you take care to inform them soon after: “The whole which the wit of man can possibly discover, either of the ways or will of the Creator, must be acquired by attending seriously,” (To what? To the Jewish or Christian revelation? No: but) “to that revelation which he hath made of himself from the beginning, in the beautiful fabric of this visible world.” p. 22.

6. I believe your opponents will not hereafter urge you, either with “that passage from St. Mark,” or any other from Scripture. At least I will not; unless I forget myself, as I observe you have done just now. For you said but now, “Before we proceed to examine testimonies for the decision of this dispute, our first care should be, to inform ourselves of the nature of those miraculous powers, which are the subject of it, as they are represented to us in the history of the gospel.” (p. 10.) Very true; “This should be our first care.” I was therefore all attention to hear your account of “the nature of those powers, as they are represented to us in the gospel.” But alas! You say not a word more about it; but slip away to those “zealous champions who have attempted” (bold men as they are) “to refute the introductory discourse.”

Perhaps you will say, “Yes, I repeat that text from St. Mark.” You do; yet not describing the nature of those powers; but only to open the way to “one of your antagonists;” (p. 12) of whom you yourself affirm, that “not one of them seems to have spent a thought in considering those powers as they are set forth in the New Testament.” (p. 11.) Consequently, the bare repeating that text does not prove you (any more than they) to have “spent one thought upon the subject.”

7. From this antagonist you ramble away to another; (p. 13) after a long citation from whom, you subjoin, “It being agreed then, that in the original promise there is no intimation of any particular period to which their continuance was limited.” (p. 14.) Sir, you have lost your way. We have as yet nothing to do with their “continuance. For till we have learned from those sacred records” (I use your own words) “what they were, and in what manner exerted by the apostles, we cannot form a proper judgment of those evidences which are brought either to confirm or confute their contin-

nuance in the church ; and must consequently dispute at random, as chance or prejudice may prompt us, about things unknown to us." p. 15. 17.

Now, Sir, if this be true, (as without doubt it is,) then it necessarily follows, that seeing, from the beginning of your book to the end, you spend not one page to *inform* either yourself or your readers, concerning the nature of these miraculous powers, "as they are represented to us in the history of the gospel :" you "dispute" throughout the whole "at random, as chance or prejudice prompts you, about things unknown to you."

8. Your reply to "the adversaries of your scheme," (p. 11,) I may let alone for the present ; and the rather, because the arguments used therein will occur again and again. Only I would here take notice of one assertion, "that the miraculous powers conferred on the apostles themselves were imparted just at the moment of their exertion, and withdrawn again as soon as those particular occasions were served." (p. 23.) You should not have asserted this, be it true or false, without some stronger proof. "This, I say, is evident," (*ibid.*) is not a sufficient proof; nor, "A treatise is prepared on that subject." (p. 24.) Neither is it proved by that comment of Grotius* on our Lord's promise, which, literally translated, runs thus : "To every believer there was then given some wonderful power, which was to exert itself, not indeed always, but when there was occasion."

9. But waiving this : I grant "the single point in dispute is, Whether the testimony of the Fathers be a sufficient ground to believe, that miraculous gifts subsisted at all, after the days of the apostles ?" (p. 27.) But with this you interweave another question, Whether the Fathers were not all fools or knaves ? In treating of which you strongly intimate, first, That such gifts did never subsist, and, secondly, That the apostles were equally wise and good, with the *wonder-workers* (your favourite term,) that followed them.

When therefore you add, "My opinion is this, that after our Lord's ascension, the extraordinary gifts he had promised were poured out on the apostles, and the other primary instruments of planting the gospel ; in order to enable them to overrule the inveterate prejudices both of the Jews and Gentiles, and to bear up against the discouraging shocks of popular rage and persecution." (p. 28.) I look upon all this to be mere grimace. You believe not one word of what you say. You cannot possibly, if you believe what you said before. For who can believe both sides of a contradiction ?

10. However, I will suppose you do believe it, and will argue with you from your own words. But first let us have a few more of them. (p. 28.) "In process of time, as miraculous powers began to be less and less wanted, so they began gradually to decline, till they were finally withdrawn. (p. 29.) And this may probably be

* Grotius in Mar. xvi. 17. *Non omnibus omnia—ita tamen cuilibet credenti tunc data sit admirabilis facultas, quæ se, non semper quidem, sed data occasione explicaret.*

thought to have happened while some of the apostles were still living."

These were given, you say, to the first planters of the gospel, "in order to enable them to overrule the inveterate prejudices both of Jews and Gentiles, and to bear up against the shocks of persecution." Thus far we are agreed. They were given for these ends. But if you allow this, you cannot suppose, consistently with yourself, that they were withdrawn till these ends were fully answered. So long, therefore, as those prejudices subsisted, and Christians were exposed to the shocks of persecution, you cannot deny but there was the same occasion for those powers to be continued, as there was for their being given at first. And this, you say, is "a postulatum, which all people will grant, that they continued as long as they were necessary to the church." (p. 11.)

11. Now, did those prejudices cease, or was persecution at an end, while some of the Apostles were still living? You have yourself abundantly shown they did not. You know, there was as sharp persecution in the third century, as there was in the first, while all the Apostles were living. And with regard to prejudices, you have industriously remarked, that "the principal writers of Rome, who make any mention of the Christians, about the time of Trajan, speak of them as a set of despicable, stubborn, and even wicked enthusiasts," (p. 193.) "That Suetonius calls them 'a race of men of a new and mischievous superstition:'" (p. 194.) And that "Tacitus, describing the horrible tortures which they suffered under Nero, says, 'They were detested for their flagitious practices; possessed with an abominable superstition, and condemned not so much for their supposed crime of firing the city, as from the hatred of all mankind.'" (p. 195.)

And "their condition," you say, "continued much the same, till they were established by the civil power: during all which time they were constantly insulted and calumniated by their heathen adversaries, as a stupid, credulous, impious sect, the very scum of mankind," (ibid.) In a word, both with regard to prejudice and persecution, I read in your following page, "The heathen magistrates would not give themselves the trouble to make the least inquiry into their manners or doctrines; but condemned them for the mere name, without examination or trial: treating a Christian of course as guilty of every crime, as an enemy of the gods, emperors, laws, and of nature itself." p. 196.

12. If then the end of those miraculous powers was to overcome inveterate prejudices, and to enable the Christians to bear up against the shocks of persecution; how can you possibly conceive that those powers should cease, while some of the apostles were living? With what colour can you assert, that they were less wanted for these ends, in the second and third, than in the apostolic age? With what shadow of reason can you maintain, that (if they ever subsisted at all) they were finally withdrawn, before Christianity was established by the civil power? Then indeed these ends did manifestly cease;

persecution was at an end ; and the inveterate prejudices which so long obtained were in great measure rooted up : another plain reason why the powers, which were to balance these, should remain in the church so long, and no longer.

13. You go on to acquaint us with the excellencies of your performance. "The reader," you say, "will find in these sheets none of those arts which are commonly employed by disputants to perplex a good cause, or to palliate a bad one : no subtle refinements, forced constructions, or evasive distinctions, but plain reasoning grounded on plain facts, and published with an honest and disinterested view, to free the minds of men from an inveterate imposture. I have shown that the ancient Fathers, by whom that delusion was imposed, were extremely credulous and superstitious : possessed with strong prejudices, and scrupling no art or means by which they might propagate the same." (p. 31.) Surely, Sir, you add the latter part of this paragraph on purpose to confute the former : for just here you use one of the unfairest arts which the most dishonest disputant can employ : in endeavouring to forestall the judgment of the reader, and to prejudice him against those men, on whom he ought not to pass any sentence, before he has heard the evidence.

1. In the beginning of your *introductory discourse*, you declare the reasons which moved you to publish it. "One of these," you say, "was the late increase of Popery in this kingdom ; chiefly occasioned," as you suppose, "by the confident assertions of the Romish emissaries, that there has been a succession of miracles in their church from the apostolic to the present age," (p. 41.) To obviate this plea, you would "settle some rule of discerning the true from the false ; so as to give a reason for admitting the miracles of one age, and rejecting those of another," p. 44.

2. This has a pleasing sound, and is extremely well imagined to prejudice a Protestant reader in your favour. You then slide with great art into your subject. "This claim of a miraculous power, now peculiar to the Church of Rome, was asserted in all Christian countries till the Reformation," (p. 44.) "But then the cheat was detected: nay, and men began to suspect, that the church had long been governed by the same arts," (p. 45.) "For it was easy to trace them up to the primitive church, though not to fix the time when the cheat began; to show, how long after the days of the apostles, the miraculous gifts continued in the church," (p. 46.) However, it is commonly believed, that they continued till Christianity was the established religion. Some indeed extend them to the fourth and fifth centuries: (p. 50.) but these, you say, betray the Protestant cause; "For in the third, fourth, and fifth, the chief corruptions of Popery were introduced, at least the seeds of them sown." "By these I mean monkery; the worship of relics; invocation of saints; prayers for the dead; the superstitious use of images; of the sacraments; of the sign of the cross, and of the consecrated oil," p. 52.

3. I have nothing to do with the fourth or fifth century. But to

what you allege in support of this charge, so far as it relates to the third century, I have a few things to reply.

And, first, you quote not one line from any Father in the third century, in favour of “monkery, the worship of relics, the invocation of saints, or the superstitious use either of images, or consecrated oil.” How is this, Sir? You brought eight accusations at once against the Fathers of the third, as well as the following centuries: and as to five of the eight, when we call for the proof, you have not one word to say! As to the sixth, “In the sacrament of the Eucharist, several abuses were introduced.” (p. 57.) You instance, first, in mixing wine with water. But how does it appear, that this was any abuse at all? Or, that “Iræneus declared it to have been taught as well as practised by our Saviour?” (p. 57.) The words you quote to prove this, do not prove it at all; they simply relate a matter of fact: “Taking the bread he confessed it to be his body, and the mixed cup, he affirmed it was his blood.” (p. 58.) You cannot be ignorant of this fact, that the cup used after the paschal supper, was always mixed with water. But “Cyprian declared, this mixture to have been enjoined to himself by a divine revelation.”* If he did, that will not prove it to be an abuse: so that you are wide of the point still. You instance next in their sending the bread to the sick; which (as well as the mixture) is mentioned by Justin Martyr. This fact likewise we allow: but you have not proved it to be an abuse. I grant, that near a hundred years after, some began to have a superstitious regard for this bread. But, that in “Tertullian’s days it was carried home and locked up as a divine treasure,” I call upon you to prove: as also, that infant-communion was an abuse; or the styling it the sacrifice of the body of Christ. (p. 59.) I believe “the offering it up for the martyrs” was an abuse; and that this with “the superstitious use of the sign of the cross” were, if not the earliest of all, yet as early as any which crept into the Christian church.

4. It is certain “praying for the dead was common in the second century,” (p. 60:) you might have said, and in the first also; seeing that petition, *Thy kingdom come*, manifestly concerns the saints in Paradise, as well as those upon earth. But it is far from certain, that “the purpose of this was, to procure relief and refreshment to the departed souls in some intermediate state of expiatory pains;” or, that this was the general “opinion of those times.”

5. As to the “consecrated oil,” (p. 63,) you seem entirely to forget, that it was neither St. Jerome, nor St. Chrysostom, but St. James, who said, ‘Is any sick among you? Let him send for the elders of the church. And let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up,’ Ch. v. ver. 14, 15.

The sum is: you have charged the Fathers of the third century with eight of “the chief corruptions of Popery:” 1. Monkery, 2.

* *Accipiens panem, suum corpus esse confitebatur; et temperamentum calicis, suum sanguinem confirmavit.*

The worship of relics, 3. Invocation of saints, 4. The superstitious use of images, 5. Of the consecrated oil, 6. Of the sacraments, 7. Of the sign of the cross, 8. Praying for the dead.

And what is all this heavy charge come to at last? Why just thus much: some of them in the beginning of the third century, did superstitiously use the sign of the cross: and others in the middle of that century offered up the eucharist for the martyrs on their annual festivals; though how you make this, "the superstitious use of the sacraments," I know not, or how these come to be the "chief corruptions of Popery." Praying thus far for the dead, 'That God would shortly accomplish the number of his elect, and hasten his kingdom,' and anointing the sick with oil, you will not easily prove to be any corruptions at all.

As to monkery, the worship of relics, invocation of saints, and the superstitious use of images; you have not even attempted to prove that these Fathers were guilty: so that, for aught appears, you might as well have charged them on the apostles. "Yet it is no more," you solemnly assure us, "than what fact and truth oblige us to say!" (p. 65.) When I meet with any of these assurances for the time to come, I shall remember to stand upon my guard.

6. In the following pages you are arguing against the miracles of the fourth and fifth centuries. After which you add, "But if these must be rejected, where then are we to stop? And to what period must we confine ourselves? This indeed is the grand difficulty, and what has puzzled all the other doctors, who have considered the same question before me," (p. 71.) Sir, your memory is short. In this very discourse you yourself said just the contrary. You told us awhile ago, that not only Dr. Marshall, Mr. Dodwell, and Archbishop Tillotson, but "the generality of the Protestant doctors were agreed, to what period" they should confine themselves: believing, that "miracles subsisted through the three first centuries, and ceased in the beginning of the fourth," p. 46. et seq.

7. However, that none of them may ever be puzzled any more, you will "lay down some general principles, which may lead us to a more rational solution of the matter, than any that has hitherto been offered." (ibid.) Here again I was all attention. And what did the mountain bring forth? What are these general principles, preceded by so solemn a declaration, and laid down for thirteen pages together? (p. 71—84.) Why, they are dwindled down into one, "That the forged miracles of the fourth century taint the credit of all the later miracles!" I should desire you to prove, that the miracles of the fourth century were *all forged*, but that it is not material to our question.

8. But you endeavour to show it is. "For that surprising confidence," you say, "with which the Fathers of the fourth age have affirmed as true what they themselves had forged, or at least knew to be forged," (a little more proof of that,) "makes us suspect, that so bold a defiance of truth could not become general at once, but must have been carried gradually to that height by custom and the exam-

ple of former times," (p. 84.) It does not appear that it did *become general* till long after the fourth century. And as this supposition is not sufficiently proved, the inference from it is nothing worth.

9. You say, Secondly, "This age, in which Christianity was established, had no occasion for any miracles. They would not therefore begin to forge miracles, at a time when there was no particular temptation to it." (ibid.) Yes, the greatest temptation in the world, if they were such men as you suppose. If they were men that "would scruple no art or means to enlarge their own credit and authority," they would naturally "begin to forge miracles" at that time, when real miracles were no more.

10. You say, Thirdly, "The later Fathers had equal piety with the earlier, but more learning and less credulity. If these then be found either to have forged miracles themselves, or propagated what they knew to be forged, or to have been deluded by the forgeries of others, it must excite the same suspicion of their predecessors." (p. 85.) I answer, 1. It is not plain that the later Fathers had equal piety with the earlier; nor, 2. That they had less credulity. It seems some of them had much more; witness Hilarion's camel, and smelling a devil or sinner; (Free Inquiry, p. 89, 90) though even he was not so quick-scented as St. Pachomius, who (as many believe to this day) could 'smell a heretic at a mile's distance.' But if, 3, the earlier Fathers were holier than the later, they were not only less likely to delude others, but (even on Plato's supposition) to be deluded themselves. For they would have more assistance from God.

11. But you say, "Fourthly, The earlier ages of the church were not purer than the later. Nay, in some respects they were worse. For there never was any age in which so many rank heresies were professed, or so many spurious books forged and published, under the names of Christ and his apostles," (Introd. Disc. p. 86:) "several of which are cited by the most eminent Fathers of those ages, as of equal authority with the Scriptures. And none can doubt but those who would forge, or make use of forged books, would make use of forged miracles," p. 87.

I answer, 1. It is allowed, that before the end of the third century, the church was greatly degenerated from its first purity. Yet I doubt not, 2. But abundantly more "*rank heresies*" have been publicly *professed* in many later ages. But they were not publicly *protested* against, and therefore historians did not record them. 3. You cannot but know it has always been the judgment of learned men, (which you are at liberty to refute if you are able,) that the far greater part of those spurious books have been forged by heretics; and that many more were compiled by weak, well-meaning men, from what had been orally delivered down from the apostles. But, 4. There have been in the church from the beginning men who had only the name of Christians. And these doubtless were capable of pious frauds (so called.) But this ought not to be charged upon the whole body. Add to this, 5, what is observed by Mr.

Daille ; ‘ I impute a great part of this mischief to those men, who, before the invention of printing, were the transcribers and copiers out of manuscripts. We may well presume that these men took the same liberty in forging as St. Jerome complains they did in corrupting books ; especially since this course was beneficial to them, which the other was not.’ Much more to the same effect we have in his treatise *Of the right use of the Fathers*, part I. chap. iii. — N. B. These transcribers were not all Christians, no, not in name : perhaps few, if any of them, in the first century. 6. By what evidences do you prove, that these spurious books “are frequently cited by the most eminent Fathers, as not only genuine, but of equal authority with the Scriptures themselves ?” Or, lastly, that they either forged these books themselves, or made use of what they knew to be forged ? These things also you are not to take for granted, but to prove, before your argument can be of force.

12. We are come at last to your “general conclusion. There is no sufficient reason to believe, that any miraculous powers subsisted in any age of the church after the times of the apostles,” p. 91.

But pretended miracles, you say, rose thus. “ As the high authority of the apostolic writings excited some of the most learned Christians” (prove that) “ to forge books under their names ; so the great fame of the apostolic miracles, would naturally excite some of the most crafty, when the apostles were dead, to attempt some juggling tricks in imitation of them. And when these artful pretenders had maintained their ground through the three first centuries, the leading clergy of the fourth understood their interest too well to part with the old plea of miraculous gifts,” p. 92. ·

Round assertions indeed ! But surely, Sir, you do not think that reasonable men will take these for proofs ! You are here advancing a charge of the blackest nature. But where are your vouchers ? Where are the witnesses to support it ? Hitherto you have not been able to produce one, through a course of three hundred years ; unless you bring in those Heathen, of whose senseless, shameless prejudices, you have yourself given so clear an account.

But you designed to produce your witnesses in the *Free Inquiry*, a year or two after the *Introductory Discourse* was published. So you condemn them first, and try them afterwards ; you will pass sentence now, and hear the evidence by and by ! A genuine specimen of that impartial regard to truth, which you profess on all occasions.

13. Another instance of this is in your marginal note. “ The primitive Christians were perpetually reproached for their gross credulity.” They were ; but by whom ? Why, by Jews and Heathens. Accordingly the two witnesses you produce here, are, Celsus, the Jew, and Julian, the apostate. But lest this should not suffice, you make them confess the charge. “ The Fathers,” your words are, “ defend themselves by saying, that they did no more than the philosophers had always done : that Pythagoras’s precepts were inculcated with an *ipse dixit*, and they found the same method useful with

the vulgar," (p. 93.) And is this their *whole* defence ? Do the very men to whom you refer, Origen and Arnobius, in the very tracts to which you refer, give no other answer, than this argument, *ad hominem* ? Stand this as another genuine proof of Dr. Middleton's candour and impartiality !

14. A further proof of your "frank and open nature," and of your "contenting yourself with the discharge of your own conscience, by a free declaration of your real sentiments," I find in the very next page. Here you solemnly declare, "Christianity is confirmed by the evidence of such miracles, as, of all others on record, are the least liable to exception, and carry the clearest marks of their sincerity ; being wrought by Christ and his apostles, for an end so great, so important, as to be highly worthy the interposition of the Deity : wrought by mean and simple men, and delivered by eye-witnesses, whose characters exclude the suspicion of fraud," (p. 94.) Sir, do you believe one word of what you so solemnly declare ? You have yourself declared the contrary. But if you do not, where shall we have you ? Or how can we believe you another time ? How shall we know, I will not say, when you speak truth, but when you would have us think you do ? By what criterion shall we distinguish between what is spoken in your real, and what in your personated character ? How discern when you speak as Dr. Middleton, and when as the *public librarian* ?

15. You go on, "By granting the Romanists but a single age of miracles after the apostles, we shall be entangled in difficulties whence we can never extricate ourselves, till we allow the same powers to the present age !" (p. 96.) I will allow them, however, three ages of miracles, and let them make what advantage of it they can.

You proceed. "If the Scriptures are a complete rule," (I reject the word *sufficient*, because it is ambiguous,) "we do not want the Fathers as guides, or if clear, as interpreters. An esteem for them has carried many into dangerous errors, the neglect of them can have no ill consequences," (p. 97.) I answer, 1. The Scriptures are a complete rule of faith and practice ; and they are clear in all necessary points. And yet their clearness does not prove, that they need not be explained ; nor their completeness, that they need not be enforced. 2. The esteeming the writings of the three first centuries, not equally with, but next to the Scriptures, never carried any man yet into dangerous errors, nor probably ever will. But it has brought many out of dangerous errors, and particularly out of the errors of popery. 3. The neglect, in *your* sense, of the primitive Fathers, that is, the thinking they were all fools and knaves, has this natural consequence, (which I grant is no ill one, according to your principles,) to make all who are not real Christians, think Jesus of Nazareth and his apostles, just as honest and wise as they.

16. You afterwards endeavour to show how the church of England came to have such an esteem for the ancient fathers. There are several particulars in this account which are liable to exception. But I let them pass, as they have little connexion with the point in question.

17. You conclude your *introductory discourse* thus: "The design of the present treatise, is to fix the religion of the protestants on its proper basis, that is, on the sacred Scriptures," (p. 111.) Here again you speak in your personated character; as also when you "freely own the primitive writers, to be of use in attesting and transmitting to us the genuine books of the Holy Scriptures!" (p. 112.) Books, for the full attestation as well as safe transmission whereof, you have doubtless the deepest concern!

18. I cannot dismiss this discourse without observing, that the uncommon artfulness and disingenuity which glare through the whole, must needs give disgust to every honest and upright heart, nor is it any credit at all to the cause you have espoused. Nay, I am persuaded there are many in these kingdoms, who, though they think as you do concerning the Christiansystem, yet could not endure the thought of writing against it in the manner that you have done; of combating fraud (if it were so) with fraud, and practising the very thing which they professed to expose and abhor.

In your *Free Inquiry* itself you propose,*

I. "To draw out in order all the principal testimonies which relate to miraculous gifts, as they are found in the writings of the fathers, from the earliest ages after the apostles; whence we shall see at one view, the whole evidence by which they have hitherto been supported."

II. "To throw together all which those fathers have delivered, concerning the persons said to have been endued with those gifts."

III. "To illustrate the particular characters and opinions of the fathers who attest those miracles," (p. 2.)

IV "To review all the several kinds of miracles which are pretended to have been wrought, and to observe from the nature of each how far they may reasonably be suspected."

V "To refute some of the most plausible objections, which have been hitherto made."

I was in hopes you would have given, at least; in entering upon your main work, what you promised so long ago, an account of "The proper nature and condition of those miraculous powers, which are the subject of the whole dispute, as they are represented to us in the history of the gospel;" (Pref. p. 10.) But as you do not appear to have any thought of doing it at all, you will give me leave at length to do it for you.

The original promise of these runs thus: 'These signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover,' Mark xvi. 17, 18.

A further account is given of them by St. Peter, on the very day whereon that promise was fulfilled. 'This is that which is spoken of by the prophet Joel, And, it shall come to pass in the last days, (said

* *Free Inquiry*, p. 1.

God,) your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams,' *Acts ii. 16, 17.*

The account given by St. Paul is a little fuller than this: 'There are diversities of gifts,' (*χαρισματα*, the usual scriptural term for the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost) 'but the same Spirit.—For to one is given the word of wisdom—to another the gifts of healing—to another the working of (other) miracles—to another prophecy—to another discernment of spirits—to another divers kinds of tongues—to another the interpretation of tongues. All these worketh that one and the same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will,' *1 Cor. xii. 8—11.*

Hence we may observe, that the chief *χαρισματα*, spiritual gifts conferred on the apostolical church, were, 1. Casting out devils; 2. Speaking with new tongues; 3. Escaping dangers in which otherwise they must have perished; 4. Healing the sick; 5. Prophecy, foretelling things to come; 6. Visions; 7. Divine dreams: and, 8. Discerning of spirits.

Some of these appear to have been chiefly designed for the conviction of Jews and Heathens, as the casting out devils, and speaking with new tongues; some chiefly for the benefit of their fellow Christians, as healing the sick, foretelling the things to come, and the discernment of spirits; and all, in order to enable those who either wrought or saw them, to 'run with patience the race set before them,' through all the storms of persecution, which the most inveterate prejudice, rage, and malice, could raise against them.

I. 1. You are, first, "To draw out in order all the principal testimonies, which relate to miraculous gifts, as they are found in the writings of the fathers from the earliest ages after the apostles."

You begin with the apostolic fathers, that is, those who lived and conversed with the apostles. "There are several," you say, "of this character, whose writings still remain to us, St. Barnabas, St. Clemens, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, St. Hermas." "Now if those gifts had subsisted after the days of the apostles, these must have possessed a large share of them. But if any of them had, he would have mentioned it in his writings, which not one of them has done," (p. 3.)

The argument fully proposed, runs thus:

If any such gifts had subsisted in them, or in their days, they must have mentioned them in their *Circular Epistles to the Churches* (for so their predecessors, the Apostles did:) but they did not mention any such gifts therein.

Sir, Your consequence is not of any force. As will easily appear by a parallel argument.

If such gifts had subsisted in St. Peter, or in his days, he must have mentioned them in his *Circular Epistles to the Churches*. But he does not mention any such gifts therein. Therefore they did not subsist in him, or in his days. Your argument, therefore, proves too much; nor can it conclude against an apostolic father, without concluding against the apostle too.

If, therefore, the apostolic fathers, had not mentioned any miraculous gifts, in their *Circular Epistles to the Churches*, you could not have inferred that they possessed none: since neither does he mention them in his Circular Epistles, whom you allow to have possessed them.

Of all the Apostles you can produce but one, St. Paul, who makes mention of those gifts. And that not in his *Circular Epistles to the Churches*. For I know not that he wrote any such.

2. All this time I have been arguing on your own suppositions, that these five apostolic fathers, all wrote *Circular Epistles to the Churches*, and yet never mentioned these gifts therein. But neither of these suppositions is true. For, 1. Hermas wrote no Epistle at all: 2. Although the rest wrote Epistles to particular Churches, (Clemens to the Corinthians, Ignatius to the Romans, &c.) yet not one of them wrote any *Circular Epistles to the Churches*, like those of St. James and St. Peter, (unless we allow that to be a genuine epistle, which bears the name of St. Barnabas.) 3. You own, they all "speak of spiritual gifts, as abounding among the Christians of that age :" but assert, "These cannot mean any thing more, than faith, hope, and charity." (p. 3.) You assert—But the proof, Sir; I want the proof. Though I am but one of the *vulgar*, yet I am not half so *credulous* as you apprehend the first Christians to have been. *Ipse dixi* will not satisfy me; I want plain, clear, logical proof; especially, when I consider, how much you build upon this; that is the main foundation whereon your hypothesis stands. You yourself must allow, that in the Epistle of St. Paul, *πνευματικά χαρισματα*, *spiritual gifts*, does always mean more than faith, hope, and charity; that it constantly means *miraculous gifts*. How then do you prove, that in the Epistles of St. Ignatius, it means quite another thing? Not miraculous gifts, but only "the ordinary gifts and graces of the gospel?" I thought "the reader" was to "find no evasive distinctions in the following sheets," (Pref. p. 31.) Prove then that this distinction is not evasive: that the same words mean absolutely different things. Till this is clearly and solidly done, reasonable men must believe that this and the like expressions mean the same thing in the writings of the apostolical fathers, as they do in the writings of the apostles; namely, not the *ordinary graces* of the gospel, but the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost.

3. You aim indeed at a proof, which would be home to the point, if you were but able to make it out. "These fathers themselves seem to disclaim all gifts of a more extraordinary kind. Thus Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, says, 'neither I, nor any other such as I am, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed Paul.' And in the same Epistle he declares, 'It was not granted to him to practise that, be ye angry, and sin not.' St. Ignatius also in his Epistles to the Ephesians, says, 'These things I prescribe to you, not as if I were somebody extraordinary. For though I am bound for his name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus.'" (p. 7, 8.) I think, verily, these extraordinary proofs may stand without any reply.

4. Yet you courteously add, “ If from the passages referred to above, or any other, it should appear probable to any, that they were favoured on some occasions, with some extraordinary illuminations, visions, or divine impressions ; I shall not dispute that point, but remind them only that these gifts were granted for their particular comfort, and do not therefore in any manner affect, or relate to the question now before us.” (p. 10.)

I ask pardon, Sir. These do so deeply affect, so nearly relate to the question now before us, even as stated by yourself, (Pref. p. 28,) that in allowing these, you give up the substance of the question. You yourself have declared, that one great end of the *extraordinary gifts* conferred on the apostles was, “ To enable them to bear up against the shocks of popular rage and persecution.” Now were not “extraordinary illuminations, visions, and impressions,” if given at all, given for this very end ? “ For their particular comfort,” as you now word it ? Therefore in allowing these to the apostolic fathers, you allow *extraordinary gifts*, which had been formerly granted to the apostles, to have “subsisted in the church after the days of the apostles,” and for the same end as they did before.

5. Therefore “ the apostolic writers have” not “left us in the dark,” with regard to our present argument. And consequently your triumph comes too soon : “ Here then we have an interval of half a century, in which we have the strongest reason to presume, that the extraordinary gifts of the apostolic age were withdrawn,” (p. 9.) No : not if all “ the apostolic fathers speak of spiritual gifts, as abounding among the Christians of that age :” not if “extraordinary illuminations, visions, and divine impressions still subsisted among them.” For as to your now putting in, “ as exerted openly in the church for the conviction of unbelievers,” I must desire you to put it out again ; it comes a great deal too late. The question between you and me was stated without it, above a hundred pages back. Although if it be admitted, it will do you no service : seeing your proposition is overthrown, if there were “miraculous gifts after the days of the apostles,” whether they were “openly exerted for the conviction of unbelievers” or not.

6. I was a little surprised, that you should take your leave of the apostolic father’s so soon. But upon looking forward, my surprise was at an end : I found you were not guilty of any design to spare them : but only delayed your remarks till the reader should be prepared for what might have shocked him, had it stood in its proper place.

I do not find indeed, that you make any objection to any part of the Epistles of Ignatius, nor of the Catholic Epistle which is inscribed with the name of Barnabas. This clearly convinces me, you have not read it ; I am apt to think, not one page of it ; seeing, if you had, you would never have let slip such an opportunity of exposing one that was called an apostolic father.

7. But it would have been strange, if you had not somewhere brought in the famous phoenix of Clemens Romanus. And yet you

are very merciful upon that head, barely remarking concerning it, that “he alleged the ridiculous story of the phoenix, as a type and proof of the resurrection,” (p. 59.) Whether “all the heathen writers treat it as nothing else but a mere fable,” I know not. But that it is so, is certain ; and consequently the argument drawn from it is weak and inconclusive. Yet it will not hence follow, that either Clemens was a wicked man, or that he had none of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

8. There is no real blemish to be found, in the whole character of St. Polycarp. But there is one circumstance left upon record concerning him, which has the appearance of weakness. And with this you do not fail to acquaint your reader at a convenient season : namely, “That in the most ancient dispute, concerning the time of holding Easter, St. Polycarp and Anicetus severally alleged apostolic tradition for their different practice,” (p. 60.) And it is not improbable; that both alleged what was true ; that in a point of so little importance the apostles varied themselves ; some of them observing it on the fourteenth day of the moon, and others not. But be this as it may, it can be no proof, either that Polycarp was not an holy man, or that he was not favoured with the extraordinary, as well as ordinary gifts of the Spirit.

9. With regard to the “narrative of his martyrdom,” you affirm, “It is one of the most authentic pieces in all primitive antiquity,” (p. 124.) I will not vouch for its authenticity : nor therefore for the story of the dove, the flame forming an arch, the fragrant smell, or the revelation to Pionius. But your attempt to *account for* these things, is truly curious. You say, “An arch of flame round his body is an appearance which might easily happen, from the common effects of wind. And the dove said to fly out of him, might be conveyed into the wood which was prepared to consume him,” (p. 129.) How much more naturally may we account for both, by supposing the whole to be a modern fiction, written on occasion of that account mentioned by Eusebius, but lost many ages ago ? But whatever may be thought of this account of his death, neither does this affect the question, whether during his life he was endued with the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost.

10. There is one of those whom you style apostolic fathers yet behind, of whom you talk full as familiarly as of the rest. I mean, Hermas : “to whom,” you say, “some impute the fraud of forging the Sibylline books,” (p. 37.) It would not have been amiss, if you had told us, which of the ancients, whether Christian, Jew, or Heathen, ever accused him of this. If none ever did, some will be apt to think, it is giving a person but hard measure, to bring an accusation against him which never was heard of, till sixteen hundred years after his death.

But I can the more easily excuse you, because he is a person whom you are wholly unacquainted with. Though it is much curiosity did not lead you, when you had archbishop Wake’s translation in your hand, to read over if it were but half a dozen pages of his

famous Shepherd. But charity obliges me to believe you never did. Otherwise I cannot conceive you would so peremptorily affirm, of him and the rest together, "There is not the least claim or pretension, in all their several pieces, to any of these extraordinary gifts, which are the subject of this inquiry," (p. 3.) I am amazed ! Sir, have you never a friend in the world ? If you were yourself ignorant of the whole affair, would no one inform you, that all the three books of Hermas, from the first page to the last, are nothing else than a recital of his "extraordinary gifts," his visions, prophecies, and revelations ?

Can you expect after this, that any man in his senses, should take your word for any thing under heaven ? That any one should credit any thing which you affirm ? Or believe you any farther than he can see you ? Jesus whom you persecute can forgive you this ; but how can you forgive yourself ? One would think, you should be crying out, day and night, 'The Shepherd of Hermas will not let me sleep.'

11. You proceed to the testimony of "Justin Martyr, who wrote about fifty years after the apostles," (p. 10.) He says (I translate his words literally,) "There are prophetic gifts among us even until now. You may see with us both women and men, having gifts from the Spirit of God." He particularly insists on that of "casting out devils, as what every one might see with his own eyes."

"Irenæus," who wrote somewhat later, "affirms, 'That all who were truly disciples of Jesus, wrought miracles in his name ; some cast out devils ; others had visions, or the knowledge of future events ; others healed the sick,' (p. 11.) "And as to raising the dead, he declares it, 'to have been frequently performed on necessary occasions, by great fasting, and the joint supplication of the church. And we hear many,' says he, 'speaking with all kinds of tongues, and expounding the mysteries of God,' " p. 12.

"Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who lived in the same age, speaks of casting out devils as then common in the church," ibid.

12. "Tertullian, who flourished toward the end of the second century, challenges the Heathen magistrates, to 'call before any of their tribunals, any person possessed with a devil. And if the evil spirit, when commanded by any Christian, did not confess himself to be a devil, who elsewhere called himself a god, they should take the life of that Christian,'" ibid.

"Minutius Felix, supposed to have written in the beginning of the third century, addressing himself to his heathen friend, says, 'The greatest part of you know what confessions the demons make concerning themselves, when we expel them out of the bodies of men,'" p. 13.

13. "Origen, something younger than Minutius, declares, that there remained still the manifest indications of the Holy Spirit. 'For the Christians,' says he 'cast out devils, perform many cures, foretell things to come.—And many have been converted to Christianity by visions. I have seen many examples of this sort,' (p. 14.)

"In another place he says, 'Signs of the Holy Ghost were shown

at the beginning of the teaching of Jesus :’ (not as you translate it, ‘*miracles began with the teaching of Jesus*,’ that is quite a different thing:) ‘ more were shown after his ascension, but afterwards fewer: However, even now there are still some remains of them with a few, whose souls are cleansed by the word, and a life conformable to it,’ (p. 15.) “ Again, ‘ Some,’ says he, ‘ heal the sick. I myself have seen many so healed, of loss of senses, madness, and innumerable other evils, which neither men nor devils can cure,’ (ibid.) ‘ And this is done, not by magical arts, but by prayer, and certain plain adjurations, such as any common Christian may use ; for generally common men do things of this kind,’ ” p. 16.

14. “ Cyprian, who wrote about the middle of the third century, says, ‘ Beside the visions of the night, even in the day-time, innocent children among us are filled with the Holy Spirit ; and in ecstasies see, and hear, and speak those things by which God is pleased to admonish and instruct us,’ (ibid.) Elsewhere he particularly mentions the casting out devils : ‘ which,’ says he, ‘ either depart immediately, or by degrees, according to the faith of the patient, or the grace of him that works the cure,’ p. 17.

“ Arnobius, who is supposed to have written in the year of Christ 303, tells us, ‘ Christ appears even now to men unpolluted, and eminently holy, who love him :—whose very name puts evil spirits to flight, strikes the prophets dumb, deprives the soothsayers of the power of answering, and frustrates the acts of arrogant magicians,’ p. 18.

“ Lactantius, who wrote about the same time, speaking of evil spirits, says, ‘ Being adjured by Christians, they retire out of the bodies of men—confess themselves to be demons, and tell their names, even the same which are adored in the temples,’ ibid.

15. “ These,” you say, “ are the principal testimonies which assert miraculous gifts through the three first centuries ; which might be supported by many more of the same kind, from the same as well as different writers. But none can scruple to risk the fate of the cause upon these,” (p. 19.) Thus far I do not scruple it. I do not doubt but the testimonies of these nine witnesses, added to the evidence of the apostolic Fathers, will satisfy every impartial man with regard to the point in question. Yet I see no cause, if there are nine witnesses more, to give up their evidence; seeing you may possibly raise objections against these which the others are unconcerned in.

If then you should invalidate what I have to reply in behalf of the witnesses now produced, you will have done but half your work : I shall afterwards require a fair hearing for the others also.

16. You close this head with remarking, 1. “ That the silence of all the apostolic writers on the subject of these gifts, must dispose us to conclude they were withdrawn,” (p. 19.) O, Sir, mention this no more. I entreat you, never name their silence again. They speak loud enough to shame you as long as you live. You cannot therefore talk with any grace of “ the pretended revival of them,

after a cessation of forty or fifty years ;" or draw conclusions from that which never was.

Your second remark is perfectly new : I dare say none ever observed before yourself, that this particular circumstance of the primitive Christians, " carried with it an air of imposture, namely, their ' challenging all the world to come and see the miracles which they wrought ! ' " (p. 21.) To complete the argument, you should have added, *And their staking their lives upon the performance of them.*

17. I doubt you have not gone one step forward yet. You have indeed advanced many bold assertions ; but you have not fairly proved one single conclusion with regard to the point in hand. But a natural effect of your lively imagination is, that from this time you argue more and more weakly ; inasmuch, as the farther you go, the more things you imagine (and only imagine) yourself to have proved. Consequently, as you gather up more mistakes every step you take, every page is more precarious than the former.

II. 1. The second thing you proposed was, " To throw together all which those Fathers have delivered concerning the persons said to have been endued with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit," p. 21.

" Now whenever we think or speak with reverence," say you, " of those primitive times, it is always with regard to these very Fathers, whose testimonies I have been collecting. And they were indeed the chief persons and champions of the Christian cause, the pastors, bishops, and martyrs of the primitive church ; namely, *Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius.*" Sir, you stumble at the threshold. A common dictionary may inform you that these were not all, either pastors, bishops, or martyrs.

2. You go on as you set out. " Yet none of these have anywhere affirmed, that they themselves were endued with any power of working miracles," (p. 22.) You should say, with any of those *extraordinary gifts* promised by our Lord, and conferred on his apostles.

No ! Have "none of these any where affirmed, that they themselves" were endued with any extraordinary gifts ? What think you of the very first of them, *Justin Martyr* ? Either you are quite mistaken in the account you give of him elsewhere, (p. 27, 30,) or he *affirmed this of himself* over and over. And as to *Cyprian*, you will by and by spend several pages together, on the extraordinary gifts he *affirmed himself* to be endued with, p. 101.

But suppose they had not "any where affirmed *this of themselves*," what would you infer therefrom ? That they were not endued with any extraordinary gifts ? Then by the very same method of arguing, you might prove that neither *St. Peter*, nor *James*, nor *John* were endued with any such. For neither do they "any where affirm *this of themselves*" in any of the writings which they left behind them.

3. Your argument concerning the apostolic Fathers is just as conclusive as this. For if you say, " The writers following the apostolic Fathers, do not affirm them to have had any miraculous gifts ; there-

fore they had none :" by a parity of reason you must say, " The writers following the apostles do not affirm them to have had any miraculous gifts ; therefore the apostles had none."

4. Your next argument against the existence of those gifts is, " That the Fathers do not tell us the names of them which had them." This is not altogether true. The names of Justin Martyr and Cyprian are pretty well known : as is, among the learned, that of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria. (p. 106, 212.) But what if they did not ? Supposing miraculous powers " were openly exerted in the church :" and that not only they themselves, but " every one else might see this whenever they pleased :" if any Heathen might *come and see* whenever he pleased, what could a reasonable man desire more ? What did it signify to him to know the names of those whom he heard prophesying, or saw working miracles ? Though without doubt, whoever saw the miracles wrought, might easily learn the names of those that wrought them ; which nevertheless the Christians had no need to publish abroad, to expose them so much the more to the rage and malice of their persecutors.

6. Your third argument is, " The Christian workers of miracles were always charged with imposture by their adversaries. Lucian tells us, ' Whenever any crafty juggler went to the Christians, he grew rich immediately.' And Celsus represents the Christian wonder-workers as mere ' vagabonds and common cheats, who rambled about to fairs and markets,' " p. 23.

And is it any wonder, that either a Jew or a Heathen should represent them thus ? Sir, I do not blame you for not believing the Christian system, but for betraying so gross a partiality : for gleaning up every scrap of Heathen scandal, and palming it upon us as unquestionable evidence ; and for not translating even these miserable fragments, with any accuracy or faithfulness. Instead of giving us the text, bad as it is, you commonly substitute a paraphrase yet worse. And this the unlearned reader naturally supposes to be a faithful translation. It is no credit to your cause if it needs such supports. And this is no credit to you if it does not.

To that of Lucian and Celsus, you add the evidence of Cæcilius too, wh. calls, say you, " these workers of miracles, a lurking nation, shunning the light." Then they were strangely altered all on a sudden. For you told us that just before, (p. 20,) they were proving themselves cheats by a widely different method ; by " calling out both upon magistrates and people, and challenging all the world to come and see what they did !"

I was not aware, that you had yet begun " to throw together all which the Fathers have delivered, concerning the persons said to have been endued with those extraordinary gifts." And, it seems, you have made an end of it ! And accordingly you proceed to sum up the evidence, to " observe upon the whole, From these characters of the primitive wonder-workers, as given both by friends and enemies, we may fairly conclude that the gifts of those ages were generally engrossed by private Christians, who travelled about from

city to city, to assist the ordinary preaching, in the conversion of Pagans, by the extraordinary miracles they pretended to perform," p. 24.

"Characters given both by friends and enemies!" Pray, Sir, what friends have you cited for this character? Or what enemies, except only Celsus the Jew? (And you are a miserable interpreter for him.) So from the single testimony of such a witness, you lay it down as an oracular truth, that all the miracle-workers of the three first ages, were vagabonds and common cheats, rambling about from city to city, to assist in converting heathens, by tricks and imposture! And this you ingenuously call, "Throwing together all which the Fathers have delivered concerning them!"

9. But to complete all, "Here again," say you, "we see a dispensation of things ascribed to God, quite different from that which we meet with in the New Testament," (p. 24.) *We see a dispensation!* Where? Not in the primitive church. Not in the writings of one single Christian: not of one Heathen; and only of one Jew; (for poor Celsus had not a second; though he multiplies under your forming hand, into a cloud of witnesses.) He alone ascribes this to the ancient Christians, which you in their name ascribe to God. With the same regard to truth you go on, "In those days the power of working miracles" (you should say, *The extraordinary gifts*) "was committed to none but those who presided in the church of Christ." *Ipse dixit*, for that. But I cannot take your word: especially when the apostles and evangelists say otherwise. "But upon the pretended revival of those powers."—Sir, we do not *pretend* the *revival* of them: seeing we shall believe they never were intermittent, till you can prove the contrary. "We find the administration of them committed, not to those who had the government of the church; not to the bishops, the martyrs, to the principal champions of the Christian cause, but to boys, to women, and above all, to 'private and obscure laymen': not only of an inferior, but sometimes also of a bad character."

Surely, Sir, you talk in your sleep. You could never talk thus, if you had your eyes open, and your understanding about you. "We find the administration of them committed, not to those who had the government of the church." No! I thought Cyprian had had the government of the church at Carthage, and Dionysius at Alexandria! "Not to the bishops." Who were these then, that were mentioned last? Bishops or no bishops? "Not to the martyrs." Well, if Cyprian was neither bishop nor martyr, I hope you will allow Justin's claim. "Not to the principal champions of the Christian cause."—And yet you told us three pages since, that "these very Fathers were the chief champions of the Christian cause in those days!" "But to boys, and to women." I answer, "This is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, It shall come to pass that I will pour out my Spirit, saith the Lord, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy!" A circumstance which turns this argument full against you, till you openly avow you do

not believe those prophecies. "And above all, to private and obscure laymen, not only of an inferior, but sometimes of a bad character." I answer, 1. You cite only one *Anti-nicene* writer, to prove them committed to "private and obscure laymen." And he says this and no more, "Generally private men do things of this kind."* By what rule of grammar you construe *ἰδιωταῖς*, *private and obscure laymen*, I know not. 2. To prove "these were sometimes men of a bad character," you quote also but one *Anti-nicene* Father. (For I presume you will not assert the genuineness of the so called) *Apostolical Constitutions.* And that one is, in effect, none at all. It is Tertullian, who in his *Prescription against Heretics*, says, "They will add many things of the authority (or power) of every heretical preacher: that they raised the dead, healed the sick, foretold things to come."† *They will add*—But did Tertullian believe them? There is no shadow of reason to think he did. And if not, what is all this to the purpose? No more than the tales of later ages which you add, concerning the miracles wrought by "bones and relics."

10. "These things," you add, "are so strange, as to give just reason to suspect, that there was some original fraud in the case, and that those strolling wonder-workers, by a dexterity of juggling, imposed upon the pious Fathers, whose strong prejudices and ardent zeal for the interest of Christianity, would dispose them to embrace, without examination, whatever seemed to promote so good a cause." (p. 25.) You now speak tolerably plain, and would be much disappointed if those, who have no strong prejudices for Christianity, did not apply what you say of these strolling wonder-workers to the Apostles, as well as their successors.

11. A very short answer will suffice. "These things are so strange." They are more strange than true. You have not proved one jot or tittle of them yet. Therefore the consequences you draw must fall to the ground till you find them some better support.

12. Nay, but "it is certain and notorious," you say, "that this was really the case in some instances" that is, that "strolling, juggling wonder-workers imposed upon the pious Fathers." (p. 26.) Sir, I must come in again with my cuckoo's note, the proof? Where is the proof? Till this is produced I cannot allow that this is certain and notorious, even in one individual instance.

13. Let us now stand still and observe, what it is you have made out, under this second head. What you proposed was, "To throw together all which the primitive Fathers had delivered, concerning the persons said to be then endued with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit." And how have you executed what you proposed? You have thrown together a quotation from a Jew, two from Heathens, three quarters of a line from Origen! and three lines from Tertullian! (nothing at all, it is true, to the point in question. But that you could not help.)

* οἱς εἰπαν ἰδιωταῖς τοιστὸν παρῆσσεν.

Origen. Cont. Cels. l. vii.

† Adjicent multa da autoritate cuiusque doctoris hæretici, illos mortuos suscitasse, debiles reformasse, &c.

14. And this, it seems, is “all you have been able to draw, from any of the primitive writers, concerning the persons who were endued with the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost!” (p. 21.) Permit me, Sir, to apply to you, what was spoken on another occasion. ‘*Sir, the well is deep, and thou hast nothing to draw:*’ neither sufficient skill, nor industry and application. Besides, you are resolved to draw out of the well, what was never in it, and must of course lose all your labour.

III. 1. You are, “Thirdly, to show the particular characters and opinions of those Fathers who attest these gifts.” Suffer me to remind you, that you mentioned nine of these, Justin, Iræneus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius. You are therefore now to show what were the “particular characters and opinions of these Fathers.” Indeed I should think, their opinions had some small relation to the question. But since you think otherwise, I am prepared to hear you.

You premise, “That an unexceptionable witness must have both judgment and honesty:” (p. 26:) and then passing over the apostolic Fathers. (as supposing them on your side,) endeavour to show, that these other Fathers had neither.

2. You begin with Justin Martyr, who, you say. “frequently affirms, that the miraculous gift of expounding the Holy Scriptures, or the mysteries of God, was granted to himself, by the special grace of God.” (p. 27.) Upon which I observe, 1. It has not yet been agreed among learned men, that *declaring the mysteries of God*, is the same thing with *expounding the Holy Scriptures*. 2. It is not clear, that Justin does affirm, his being endued either with one or the other. At least, not from the passages you cite. The first, literally thus: * ‘He hath revealed to us whatsoever things we have understood by his grace from the Scriptures also:’ the other, † ‘I have not any such power; but God has given me the grace to understand his Scriptures.’ Now, Sir, by which of these does it appear, that Justin affirms he had the *miraculous gift of expounding* the Scriptures?

3. However, you will affirm it, were it only to have the pleasure of confuting it. In order to which you recite three passages from his writings, wherein he interprets Scripture weakly enough: and then add, (after a strained compliment to Dr. Grabe, and a mangled translation of one of his remarks,) “His works are but little else than a wretched collection of interpretations of the same kind. Yet this pious Father insists, that they were all suggested to him from heaven.” (p. 30.) No: neither the one nor the other. Neither do interpretations of Scripture (good or bad) make the tenth part of his writings; nor does he insist, that all those which are found therein. “were suggested to him from heaven.” This does not follow from any passage you have cited yet: nor from his saying in a particular case, “Do you think I could have understood these things in the

* Απέκαλυψεν σὺ ημῖν παντα σα καὶ απὸ τῶν γραφῶν διὰ τῆς χαρῆς αὐτοῦ νεγοηκαμεν. Dialogue, part 2.

† Οὐδέ γαρ δυνατές εροι τοιαντῆς εἰσιν, αλλα χαρές ταῦτα Οὐσιοθήμονεις εἰς τοις συντεταγμέναις γραφαῖς. Ibid.

Scriptures, if I had not by the will of God received the grace to understand them?"

4. However, now you clap your wings. "What credit," say you, "can be due to this Father, in the report of other people's gifts, who was so grossly deceived, or willing at least to deceive others, in this confident attestation of his own?" The answer is plain and obvious. It is not clear, that he attests his own at all. Consequently, as yet his credit is unblemished.

"But he did not understand Hebrew, and gave a wrong derivation of the Hebrew word, Satan." Allowing this, that he was no good etymologist, his credit as a witness may be as good as ever.

5. But to blast his credit for ever, you will now reckon up all the heresies which he held. And first, "He believed the doctrine of the Millennium; or, 'That all the saints should be raised in the flesh, and reign with Christ, in the enjoyment of all sensual pleasures, for a thousand years before the general resurrection.' (p. 31.) These you mark as though they were Justin's words. I take knowledge you hold, no faith is to be kept with heretics: and that all means are fair which conduce to so good an end, as driving the Christian heresy out of the world.

It is by this principle only that I can account for your adding, "Which doctrine" [that of their enjoying all sensual pleasures] "he deducts from the testimony of the prophets: and of St. John the Apostle; and was followed in it by the Fathers of the second and third centuries."

The doctrine, (as you very well know,) which Justin "deduced from the Prophets and the Apostles," and "in which he was" undoubtedly "followed by the Fathers of the second and third centuries," is this:

The souls of them who have been martyred for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who have not worshipped the beast, neither received his mark, shall live and reign with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead shall not live again, until the thousand years are finished. Now to say, they believed this, is neither more nor less than to say, they believed the Bible.

6. The second heresy you charge him with is the believing, "that those sons of God, mentioned Gen. vi. 4. of whom it is there said, 'They came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them:' were evil angels." (p. 32.) And I allow, he too lightly received this on the testimony of the Jewish commentators. But this only proves, that he was a fallible man: not that he was a knave; or that he had not eyes and ears.

7. You charge him, thirdly, with "treating the spurious books, published under the names of the Sibyl and Hystaspes, with the same reverence as the prophetic Scriptures." (ibid.) His words are,

By the power of evil spirits, it was made death, to read the books of Hystaspes, or of the Sibyl, or of the prophets.' Well: how does this prove, that he "treated those books with the same reverence as the prophetic Scriptures?"

But "it is certain," you say, "that from this example and autho-

rity of Justin, they were held in the highest veneration, by the Fathers and rulers of the church, through all succeeding ages." (ibid.)

I do not conceive, it is certain. I wait your proof, first, of the fact: next, of the reason you assign for it. The fact itself, that "these books were held in the highest veneration, by the Fathers and rulers through all succeeding ages," is in nowise proved by that single quotation from Clemens Alexandrinus, (p. 34.) wherein he urges the Heathens with the testimonies of their own authors, of the Sibyl, and of Hystaspes. We cannot infer from hence, that he himself "held them in the highest veneration :" much less, that all the Fathers did. And as to the reason you assign for that veneration, the example and authority of Justin, you cite no writer of any kind, good or bad. So he that will believe it may.

But "some" you tell us, "impute the forging of these books to Justin." Be pleased to tell us, likewise, who those are; and what grounds they allege for that imputation. Till then it can be of no signification.

8. You charge him, fourthly, "With believing that silly story, concerning the Septuagint version of the Old Testament: with saying, that he himself, when at Alexandria, saw the remains of the cells in which the translators were shut up: and with making a considerable mistake in the chronology relating thereto." (p. 37.) And if all this be allowed, and over and above, that he "frequently cites apocryphal books, and cites the Scripture by memory :" what have you gained toward the proof of your grand conclusion, that "he was either too great a fool, or too great a knave, to be believed touching a plain matter of fact?"

9. You seem sensible of this, and therefore add, fifthly, "It will be said, perhaps, that these instances show a weakness of judgment, but do not touch the credit of Justin as a witness of fact." (p. 29.) But can you scrape up nothing from all the dunghills of antiquity that does? I dare say, you will do your utmost. And, first, you reply, "The want of judgment alone may, in some cases, disqualify a man from being a good witness. Thus Justin himself was imposed upon by those of Alexandria, who showed him some old ruins under the name of cells.—And so he was by those who told him, there was a statue at Rome, inscribed *Simoni Deo Sancto* ;" (p. 40,) "whereas it was really inscribed, *Semoni Sancto Deo* ; to an old deity of the Sabines." "Now," say you, "if he was deceived in such obvious facts, how much more easily would he be deceived by subtle and crafty impostors." (p. 41.) Far less easily. A man of good judgment may be deceived in the inscriptions of statues and points of ancient history. But if he has only eyes and ears, and a small degree of common sense, he cannot be deceived in facts where he is both an eye and ear witness.

10. For a parting blow, you endeavour to prove, sixthly, that Justin was a knave as well as a fool. To this end you remark, "That he charges the Jews with erasing three passages out of the Greek bible: one whereof stands there still, and the other two were not expunged by some Jew, but added by some Christian. Nay, that "able critic

and divine, John Croius," (you know when to bestow honourable appellations.) " says, ' Justin forged and published this passage, for the confirmation of the Christian doctrine, as well as the greatest part of the Sibylline oracles, and the sentences of Mercurius.'

With far greater probability than John Croius asserts, that Justin forged these passages, a man of candour would hope that he read them in his copy (though incorrect) of the Greek bible. And till you disprove this, or prove the assertion of Croius, you are got not a jot further still. But notwithstanding you have taken true pains to blacken him, both with regard to his morals and understanding, he may still be an honest man, and an unexceptionable witness, as to plain facts done before his face.

11. You fall upon Irenæus next, and carefully enumerate all the mistakes in his writings. As first, that he held the doctrine of the Millennium, and related a weak fancy of Papias concerning it. Secondly, that he believed our Saviour to have lived fifty years. Thirdly, that he believed Enoch and Elias were translated, and St. Paul caught up to that very Paradise from which Adam was expelled; (so he might, and *all the later Fathers* with him, without being either the better or the worse.) Fourthly, that he believed the story concerning the Septuagint version: nay, and that the Scriptures were *destroyed* in the Babylonish captivity, but restored again after seventy years by Esdras, inspired for that purpose. (p. 44.) "In this also," (you say, but do not prove) "he was followed by all the principal Fathers that succeeded him; although there is no better foundation for it, than that fabulous relation in the second book of Esdras." You add, fifthly, that he believed that the sons of God, who came in to the daughters of men, were evil angels. And all the early Fathers, you are very ready to believe, "were drawn into the same errors, by the authority of the apocryphal book of Enoch, cited by St. Jude."

12. It is not only out of your good will to St. Jude, or Irenæus, you gather up these fragments of error, that nothing may be lost, but also to the whole body of the ancient Christians. "For all those absurdities," you say, "were taught by the Fathers of those ages" (naturally implying, by all the Fathers) "as doctrines of the universal church derived immediately from the Apostles; and thought so necessary, that those who held the contrary, were hardly considered as real Christians." Here I must beg you to prove as well as assert.

1. That all these absurdities of the Millennium in the grossest sense of it, of the age of Christ, of paradise, of the destruction of the Scriptures, of the Septuagint version, and of evil angels mixing with women, were taught by all the Fathers of those ages; 2. That all those Fathers taught these as doctrines of the universal church, derived immediately from the Apostles; and, 3. That they all denied those to be real Christians, who held the contrary.

13. You next cite two far-fetched interpretations of Scripture, and a weak saying out of the writings of Irenæus. But all three prove no more, than that in these instances he did not speak with strictness of judgment: not that he was incapable of knowing what he saw with his own eyes, or of truly relating it to others.

Before we proceed to what, with equal good humour and impartiality, you remark concerning the rest of these Fathers, it will be proper to consider what more is *interspersed* concerning these "in the sequel of this argument" -

14. And, first, you say, "Justin used an inconclusive argument for the existence of the souls of men after death." (p. 67.) It is possible he might, but whether it was conclusive or not, this does not affect his moral character.

You say, secondly, "It was the common opinion of all the Fathers, taken from the authority of Justin Martyr, that the dæmons wanted the fumes of the sacrifices to strengthen them for the enjoyment of their lustful pleasures." (p. 69.)

Sir, no man of reason will believe this concerning one of the Fathers upon your bare assertion. I must, therefore, desire you to prove by more than a scrap of a sentence, 1. That Justin himself held this opinion ; 2. That he invented it ; 3. That it was the common opinion of all the Fathers ; and 4. That they all took it on his authority.

15. You affirm, thirdly, "He says, that all devils yield and submit to the name of Jesus : as also to the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." (p. 85.) Very likely he may.

Lastly, you cite a passage from him, concerning the Spirit of God influencing the minds of holy men. But neither does this in any measure affect his credit as a witness of fact. Consequently, after all that you "have been able to draw," either from himself, or "any of the primitive writers," here is one witness of unquestionable credit, touching the miracles wrought in the primitive church ; touching the subsistence of the extraordinary gifts after the day of the Apostles.

16. But let us come once more to Irenæus ; for you have not done with him yet. "Forgery," you say, "has been actually charged upon Justin," (by John Croius and Dr. Middleton,) "and may with equal reason be charged on Irenæus. For what other account can be given of his frequent appeals to apostolical tradition, for the support of so many incredible doctrines?" (p. 111.) Why, this very natural one, that in non-essential points he too easily followed the authority of Papias, a weak man, who, on slight grounds, believed many trifling things to have been said or done by the Apostles. And, allowing all this, yet it does not give us so "lamentable an idea of those primitive ages and primitive champions of the Christian cause." (p. 59.)

The same account may be given of his mistake, concerning the age of our Lord, (ibid.) There is therefore as yet neither reason nor any plausible pretence for laying forgery to his charge. And, consequently, thus far his credit, as a witness, stands clear and unimpeached.

But you say, secondly, "He was a zealous asserter of tradition." (p. 61.) He might be so, and yet might be an honest man : and that, whether he was mistaken or not, in supposing Papias to have been a disciple of John the Apostle." (p. 64.)

You say, thirdly, he supposed, "that the disciples of Simon Magus, as well as of Carpocrates, used magical arts :" (p. 68,) "that

the dead were frequently raised in his time :" (p. 72.) " that the Jews, by the name of God, cast out devils :" and " that many had even then the gift of tongues, although he had it not himself." (p. 85.) This is the whole of your charge against Irenæus, when summed up and laid together. And now let any reasonable person judge, whether all this gives us the least cause to question, either his having sense enough to discern a plain matter of fact, or honesty enough to relate it. Here then is one more credible witness of miraculous gifts after the days of the Apostles.

18. What you advance concerning the history of tradition, I am neither concerned to defend nor to confute. Only I must observe, you forget yourself again where you say, " the fable of the Millennium, of the old age of Christ, with many more, were all embraced by the earliest Fathers." (p. 64.) For modesty's sake, Sir, think a little before you speak, and remember you yourself informed us, that one of these was never embraced at all, but by one single Father only.

19. " I cannot," you say; " dismiss this article, without taking notice, that witchcraft was universally believed through all ages of the primitive church." (p. 66.) This you show by citations from several of the Fathers: who likewise believed, as you inform us, that " evil spirits had power frequently to afflict either the bodies or minds of men: that they acted the parts of the Heathen gods, and assumed the forms of those who were called from the dead. Now this opinion," say you, " is not only a proof of the grossest credulity, but of that species of it, which, of all others, lays a man most open to imposture." (p. 70.)

And yet this opinion, as you know full well, has its foundation not only in the histories of all ages, and all nations throughout the habitable world, even where Christianity never obtained: but particularly in Scripture: in abundance of passages both of the Old and New Testament: as where the Israelites were expressly commanded not to ' suffer a witch to live,' Exod. xxii. 18: where St. Paul numbers *witchcraft* with ' the works of the flesh,' and ranks it with adultery and idolatry, Gal. v. 19, 20: and where St. John declares, ' without, are sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers,' Rev. xxii. 15.

That ' the gods of the Heathens are devils,' is declared in terms, by one of those who are styled inspired writers, 1 Cor. x. 20. And many conceive that another of them gives us a plain instance of their ' assuming the form of those who were called from the dead,' 1 Sam. xxviii. 13, 14.

Of the power of the evil spirits to afflict the minds of men, none can doubt who believe there are any such beings. And of their power to afflict the body we have abundant proof both in the history of Job, and that of the gospel demoniacs. I do not mean, Sir, to accuse *you* of believing these things: you have shown, that you are guiltless in this matter; and that you pay no more regard to that antiquated book, the Bible, than you do to the second book of Esdras. But, alas! The Fathers were not so far enlightened. And because they were bigotted to that old book, they, of consequence, held for truth, what you assure us was mere delusion and imposture.

20. Now to apply. "A mind," you say, "so totally possessed by superstitious fancies, could not even suspect the pretensions of those vagrant jugglers, who in those primitive ages were so numerous and so industriously employed, in deluding their fellow-creatures. Both Heathens, Jews, and Christians, are all allowed to have had such impostors among them." (p. 71.) By whom, Sir, is this allowed of the Christians? By whom, but Celsus, was it ever affirmed of them? Who informed you of their growing so *numerous*? And using such *industry* in their employment? To speak the plain truth, your *mind* appears to be *so totally possessed by* these *vagrant jugglers*, that you cannot say one word about the primitive church, but they immediately start up before you; though there is no more proof of their ever existing, than of a witch's sailing in an egg-shell.

21. You conclude this head: "When pious Christians are arrived to this pitch of credulity, as to believe that evil spirits, or evil men can work miracles in opposition to the gospel; their very piety will oblige them to admit as miraculous, whatever is pretended to be wrought in defence of it." (p. 71.) Once more you have spoken out: you have shown without disguise, what you think of St. Paul, and the *lying miracles*, 2 Thess. ii. 9, which he (poor man!) believed evil spirits or evil men could work in opposition to the gospel: and of St. John, talking so idly of him who 'doeth great wonders, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth,' (even though they were not Christians) 'by means of those miracles which he hath power to do,' Rev. xiii. 13; 14.

22. You have now finished the third thing you proposed, which was, "To show the particular characters of the several Fathers, who attest," that they were eye and ear-witnesses of the extraordinary gifts in the primitive church. You named nine of these, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius; at the same time observing, that many other writers attest the same thing. But let the others stand by. Are these good men and true? That is the present question.

You say, No. And to prove that these *nine* are knaves, bring several charges against *two* of them. These have been answered at large; some of them proved to be false; some, though true, yet not invalidating their evidence.

But supposing we waive the evidence of these two, here are seven more still to come. Oh! but you say, "If there were twice seven, they only repeat the words which those have taught them."

You say. But how often must you be reminded, that saying and proving are two things? I grant, in three or four opinions, some (though not all) of these were mistaken as well as those two. But this by no means proves, that they were all knaves together; or that if Justin Martyr or Irenæus speaks wrong, I am therefore to give no credit to the evidence of Theophilus or Minutius Felix.

23. You have, therefore, made a more lame piece of work on this head, (if possible) than on the preceding. You have promised great things, and performed just nothing. You have left above three parts in four of your work entirely untouched; as these two are not a

fourth part even of the writers you have named, as attesting the continuance of the *extraordinary gifts* after the age of the apostles.

But you have taught that trick at least to your *vagrant jugglers*, to supply the defect of all other arguments. At every dead lift you are sure to play upon us these dear creatures of your own imagination. They are the very strength of your battle, the tenth legion. Yet if a man impertinently calls for proof of their existence, if he comes close and engages them hand to hand, they immediately vanish away.

IV. You are, in the fourth place, to "review all the several kinds of miraculous gifts which are pretended to have been given; and to observe from the nature of each, how far they may reasonably be suspected." p. 72.

"These," you say, "are, 1. The power of raising the dead; 2. Of healing the sick; 3. Of casting out devils; 4. Of prophesying; 5. Of seeing visions; 6. Of discovering the secrets of men; 7. Of expounding the Scriptures; 8. Of speaking with tongues."

I had rather have had "an account of the miraculous powers as they are represented to us in the history of the gospel." But that account you are not inclined to give. So we will make the best of what we have.

Sect. I. 1. And, first, As to "raising the dead. Irenæus affirms, This was frequently performed on very necessary occasions; when by great fastings and the joint supplication of the church, the spirit of the dead person returned into him, and the man was given back to the prayers of the saints."

2. But you object, "There is not an instance of this to be found in the three first centuries." (p. 72.) I presume you mean, no Heathen historian has mentioned it, (for Christian historians were not.) I answer, 1. It is not probable a Heathen historian would have related such a fact, had he known it. 2. It is equally improbable, he should know it: seeing the Christians knew with whom they had to do: and that, had such an instance been made public, they would not long have enjoyed him who had been given back to their prayers. They could not but remember what had been before; when the Jews sought Lazarus also to kill him: a very obvious reason why a miracle of this particular kind, ought not to have been published abroad: especially, considering, 3. That it was not designed for the conversion of the Heathens; but on occasions necessary for the good of the Church, of the Christian community: Lastly, It was a miracle proper above all others, to support and confirm the Christians, who were daily tortured and slain, but sustained by the hope of obtaining a better resurrection.

3. You object, secondly, "The Heathens constantly affirmed the thing itself to be impossible." (p. 73.) They did so. But is it a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?

4. You object, thirdly, "That when Autolycus, an eminent Heathen, scarcely forty years after this, said to Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, 'Show me but one raised from the dead, that I may see

and believe ;' **Theophilus could not.**" (ibid.) Supposing he could not, I do not see that this contradicts the testimony of Irenæus; for he does not affirm, (though you say, (p. 72,) he does) that this was "performed, as it were, in every parish, or place where there was a Christian church." He does not affirm, that it was performed at Antioch: probably, not in any church, unless where a concurrence of important circumstances required it. Much less does he affirm, that the persons raised in France, would be alive forty years after. Therefore, although it be granted, 1. That the historians of that age are silent; 2. That the Heathens said, the thing was impossible; 3. That **Theophilus did not answer the challenge of the Heathen Autolycus**: all this will not invalidate in any degree, the express testimony of Irenæus, or prove, that none had been raised from the dead, since the days of the apostles.

Sect. II. 1. "The next gift is, that of healing the sick; often performed by anointing them with oil; in favour of which," as you observe, "the ancient testimonies are more full and express." (p. 75.) But "this," you say, "might be accounted for without a miracle, by the natural efficacy of the oil itself." (p. 76.) I doubt not. Be pleased to try, how many you can cure thus, that are blind, deaf, dumb, or paralytic: and experience, if not philosophy, will teach you, that oil has no such natural efficacy as this.

2. Of this you seem not insensible already, and therefore fly away to your favourite supposition, that "they were not cured at all: that the whole matter was a cheat from the beginning to the end." But by what arguments do you evince this? The first is, "The Heathens pretended to do the same.. Nay, and managed the imposture with so much art, that the Christians could neither deny nor detect it: but insisted always, that it was performed by demons, or evil spirits." (p. 76.) But still the Heathens maintained, "The cures were wrought by their gods, by *Æsculapius* in particular." And where is the difference? Seeing, as was observed before, the gods of the Heathens were but devils.

3. But, you say, "Although public monuments were erected in proof and memory of these cures, at the time when they were performed, yet it is certain all those Heathen miracles were pure forgeries." (p. 79.) How is it certain? If you can swallow this without good proof, you are far more credulous than I. I cannot believe, that the whole body of the Heathens, for so many generations, were utterly destitute of common sense, any more than of common honesty. Why should you fix such a charge on whole cities and countries? You could have done no more, if they had been Christians!

4. But "diseases thought fatal and desperate, are oft surprisingly healed of themselves. And, therefore, we cannot pay any great regard to such stories, unless we knew more precisely in this case the real bounds between nature and miracle." (p. 79.) Sir, I understand you well. The drift of the argument is easily seen. It points at the Master as well as his servants: and tends to prove, that after all this talk about miraculous cures, we are not sure, there were ever any

in the world. But it will do no harm. For although we grant, 1. That some recover, even in seemingly desperate cases, and, 2. That we do not know in any case, the precise bounds between nature and miracle; yet it does not follow, therefore, I cannot be assured, there ever was a miracle of healing in the world. To explain this by instance. I do not precisely know how far nature may go, in healing, that is, in restoring sight to the blind. Yet this I assuredly know, that if a man born blind, is restored to sight by a word, this is not nature, but miracle. And to such a story, well attested, all reasonable men will pay the highest regard.

5. The sum of what you have advanced on this head, is, 1. That the Heathens themselves had miraculous cures among them; 2. That oil may cure some diseases, by its natural efficacy; and, 3. That we do not know the precise bounds of nature. All this I allow. But all this will not prove that no miraculous cures were performed, either by our Lord and his apostles, or by those who lived in the three succeeding centuries.

Sect. III. 1. The third of the miraculous powers said to have been in the primitive church, is that of casting out devils. The testimonies concerning this are out of number, and as plain as words can make them. To show, therefore, that all these signify nothing, and that there were never any devils cast out at all, (neither by the apostles, nor since the apostles, for the argument proves both or neither,) is a task worthy of you. And (to give you your just praise) you have here put forth all your strength.

2. And yet I cannot but apprehend, there was a much shorter way. Would it not have been readier to overthrow all those testimonies at a stroke, by proving, there never was any Devil in the world? Then the whole affair of casting him out had been at an end.

But it is in condescension to the weakness and prejudices of mankind, that you go less out of the common road, and only observe, "That those who were said to be possessed of the Devil, may have been ill of the falling sickness." "And their symptoms," you say, "seem to be nothing else but the ordinary symptoms of an epilepsy." p. 81.

If it be asked, but were "the speeches and confessions of the devils, and their answering to all questions, nothing but the ordinary symptoms of an epilepsy?" You take in a second hypothesis, and account for these "by the arts of imposture and contrivance, between the persons concerned in the act." p. 82.

But is not this something extraordinary, that men in epileptic fits, should be capable of so much art and contrivance? To get over this difficulty, we are to suppose that art and contrivance were the main ingredients: so that we are to add only *quantum sufficit* of the epilepsy, and sometimes to leave it out of the composition.

But the proof, Sir, where is the proof? I want a little of that too. Instead of this we have only another supposition, "That all the fathers were either induced by their prejudices, to give too hasty credit to these pretended possessions, or carried away by their

zeal to support a delusion, which was useful to the Christian cause." p. 81.

I grant they were prejudiced in favour of the Bible. But yet we cannot fairly conclude from hence, either that they were one and all continually deceived by merely pretended possessions: or, that they would all lie for God, a thing absolutely forbidden in that book.

3. But "leaders of sects," you say, "whatever principles they pretend to, have seldom scrupled to use a *commodious lie*." (p. 83.) I observe, you are quite impartial here. You make no exception of age or nation. It is all one to you, whether your reader applies this to the son of Abdalla, or the son of Mary. And yet, Sir, I cannot but think there was a difference. I fancy the Jew was an honester man than the Arabian: and though Mahomet used many a *commodious lie*, yet Jesus of Nazareth did not.

4. However, "Not one of these fathers made any scruple of using the hyperbolical style," (that is, in plain English, of lying) "as an eminent writer of ecclesiastical history declares." (ibid.) You should have said an impartial writer. For who would scruple that character to Mr. Le Clerc? And yet I cannot take either his or your bare word for this. Be pleased to produce a little proof. Hitherto you have proved absolutely nothing on the head, but (as your manner is) taken all for granted.

5. You next relate that famous story taken from Tertullian. "A woman went to the theatre, and returned possessed with a devil. When the unclean spirit was asked, how he dared to assault a Christian? He answered, I found her on my own ground." (p. 83.) After relating another, (which you endeavour to account for naturally,) you intimate, that this was a mere lie of Tertullian's. But how is that proved? Why, "Tertullian was an utter enemy to plays and public shows in the theatre." He was so. But can we infer from thence, that he was an utter enemy to common honesty?

6. You add, "The fathers themselves own, that even the Jews, yea and the Heathens, cast out devils." (p. 84.) "Now it will be granted, that these Jewish and Heathen exorcists were mere cheats and impostors. But the fathers believed, they really cast them out. Now if they could take their tricks for the effects of a supernatural power, well might they be deceived by their own impostors. Or, they might think it convenient to oppose one cheat to another." (p. 87, 88.)

"Deceived," say you, "by their impostors?" Why I thought they were the very men who set them to work! Who opposed one cheat to another. Apt scholars, who acted their part so well, as even to deceive their masters! But whatever the Heathen were, we cannot grant, that all the "Jewish exorcists were impostors." Whether the Heathens cast out devils or not, it is sure the *sons of the Jews cast them out*. I mean, upon supposition, that Jesus of Nazareth cast them out: which is a point not here to be disputed.

7. But "it is very hard to believe what Origen declares, that the devils used to possess and destroy cattle." You might have said, what Matthew and Mark declare, concerning the herd of swine. And yet we shall find you by and by believing far harder things than this.

Before you subjoined the silly story of Hilarian and his camel, you should, in candour, have informed your reader, that it is disputed, whether the life of Hilarian was written by St. Jerome or not! But be it as it may, I have no concern with either. For they did not live within the three first ages.

8. I know not what you have *proved* hitherto, though you have *affirmed* many things, and *intimated* more. But now we come to the strength of the cause, contained in your five observations.

You observe, first, "That all the primitive accounts of casting out devils, though given by different fathers, and in different ages, yet exactly agree with regard to all the main circumstances." (p. 92.) And this you apprehend to be a mark of imposture. "It looks," you say, "as if they copied from each other!" Now a vulgar reader would have imagined, that any single account of this kind must be rendered much more (not less) credible, by parallel accounts of what many had severally seen, at different times, and in different places.

9. You observe, secondly, "That the persons thus possessed, were called, Εγγειούσαι, ventriloquists;" (some of them were) "because they were generally believed to speak out of the belly." (ibid.) "Now there are at this day," you say, "those who by art and practice can speak in the same manner. If we suppose then that there were artists of this kind among the ancient Christians, how easily, by a correspondence between the ventriloquist and the exorcist, might they delude the most sensible of their audience?"

But what did the *ventriloquist* do with his *epilepsy* in the mean time? You must not let it go. Because many of the circumstances wherein all these accounts agree, cannot be tolerably accounted for without it. And yet how will you make these two agree? It is a point worthy your serious consideration,

But cheats doubtless they were, account for it who can. Yet it is strange, none of the Heathen should find them out: that the imposture should remain quite undiscovered till fourteen hundred years after the impostors were dead! He must have a very large faith, who can believe this: who can suppose, that not one of all those impostors, should either through inadvertence, or in the midst of tortures and death, have once intimated any such thing.

10. You observe, thirdly, "That many demoniacs could not be cured by all the power of the exorcists, and that the cures which were pretended to be wrought on any, were but temporary; were but the cessation of a particular fit, or access of the distemper. This," you say, "is evident from the testimony of antiquity itself, and may be clearly collected from the method of treating them in the ancient church," p. 92.

Sir, you are the most obliging disputant in the world: for you continually answer your own arguments. Your last observation confuted all that you had advanced before. And now you are so kind as to confute that. For if, after all, these demoniacs were real epileptics, and that in so high a degree as to be wholly incurable, what becomes of their art and practice? And of the very good correspondence between the ventriloquist and the exorcist?

Having allowed you your supposition just so long, as may suffice to confute yourself, I must now observe, it is not true. For all that "is evident from the testimony of antiquity" is this: that although many demoniacs were wholly delivered, yet some were not, particularly in the third century: but continued months or years, with only intervals of ease, before they were entirely set at liberty.

11. You observe, fourthly, "That great numbers of demoniacs subsisted in those early ages, whose chief habitation was in a part of the church, where, as in a kind of hospital, they were under the care of the exorcists." (p. 94.) "Which will account for the confidence of those challenges made to the Heathens by the Christians, to come and see how they could drive the devils out of them, while they kept such numbers of them in constant pay: always ready for the show; tried and disciplined by your exorcists to groan and howl, and give proper answers to all questions," p. 95.

So now "the correspondence between the ventriloquist and the exorcist" is grown more close than ever! But the misfortune is, this observation likewise wholly overthrows that which went before it. For if all the groaning, and howling, and other symptoms, were no more than what they "were disciplined to by their exorcists," (p. 95,;) then it cannot be, that "many of them could not possibly be cured by all the power of those exorcists," (p. 92.) What! could they not possibly be taught to know their masters? And to what end as well as when to begin the show? One would think, that the cures wrought upon these might have been more than temporary. Nay, it is surprising, that while they had such numbers of them, they should ever suffer the same person to show twice.

12. You observe, fifthly, "That whereas this power of casting out devils, had hitherto been in the hands only of the meaner part of the laity: (that wants proof) it was, about the year 367, put under the direction of the clergy; it being then decreed by the counsel of Laodicea, that none should be exorcists but those appointed (or ordained) by the bishop. But no sooner was this done, even by those who favoured and desired to support it, than the gift itself gradually decreased and expired." p. 95.

You here overthrow not only your immediately preceding observation, (as usual) but likewise what you have observed elsewhere, "That the exorcists began to be ordained about the middle of the third century." If so, what need of decreeing it now, above a hundred years after? Again, if the exorcists were ordained a hundred years before this council sat, what change was made by the decree of the council? Or how came the power of casting out devils to cease

upon it ? You say, the bishops “ still favoured and desired to support it.” Why then did they not support it ? It must have been they (not the poor exorcists, who were but a degree above sextons) who had hitherto “ kept such numbers of them in pay.” What was become of them now ? Were all the groaners and howlers dead ? And no more to be procured for money ? Or rather, did not the bishops, think you, grow covetous as they grew rich, and so kept fewer and fewer of them in pay, till at length the whole business dropped ?

13. These are your laboured objections against the great promise of our Lord, *In my name shall they cast out devils* : whereby (to make sure work) you strike at him and his apostles, just as much as at the primitive Fathers. But by a strange jumble of ideas in your head, you would prove so much that you prove nothing. By attempting to show all, who claimed this power, to be at once both fools and knaves, you have spoiled your whole cause, and, in the event, neither shown them to be one nor the other : as the one half of your argument all along just serves to overthrow the other. So that after all, the ancient testimonies touching this gift, remain firm and unshaken.

Sect. IV. 1. You told us above, That “ the fourth miraculous gift was that of prophesying,” the fifth of “ seeing visions,” the sixth of “ discovering the secrets of men,” (p. 72.) But here you jumble them all together, telling us, “ The next miraculous gift is that of prophetic visions, and ecstatic trances,” (*ecstatic ecstacies* you might have said,) “ and the discovery of men’s hearts.” (p. 96.) But why do you thrust all three into one ? Because, you say, these seem to be the fruit of one spirit. Most certainly they are, whether it was the spirit of truth, or (as you suppose) the spirit of delusion.

2. However, it is the second of these on which you chiefly dwell, (the fifth of those you before enumerated,) taking but little notice of the fourth, “ foretelling things to come,” and none at all of the sixth, “ discovering the secrets of men.” The testimonies therefore for these remain in full force, as you do not even attempt to invalidate them. With regard to “ visions or ecstacies,” you observe, first, That Tertullian calls *ecstacy*, “ a temporary loss of senses.” (p. 97.) It was so, of the outward senses, which were then locked up. You observe, secondly, That “ Suidas” (a very primitive writer, who lived between eight and nine hundred years after Tertullian !) “ says, That of all the kinds of madness, that of the poets and prophets was alone to be wished for.” I am at a loss to know what this is brought to prove. The question is, were there visions in the primitive church ? You observe, thirdly, that Philo the Jew says, (I literally translate his words, which you do not, for it would not answer your purpose,) “ When divine light shines, the human sets ; but when that sets, this rises. This uses to befall the prophets,” (p. 98.) Well, Sir, and what is this to the question ? Why, “ from these testimonies,” you say, “ we may collect, that the vision or ecstacy of the primitive church was of the same kind with that of the Delphic Pythia, or the Cumæan Sibyl.”

Well collected indeed ! But I desire a little better testimony, than

either that of Philo the Jew, or Suidas, a lexicographer of the eleventh century, before I believe this. How little Tertullian is to be regarded on this head, you yourself show in the very next page.

3. You say, fourthly, "Montanus and his associates were the authors of these trances. They first raised this spirit of enthusiasm in the church, and acquired great credit by their visions and ecstasies." Sir, you forget; they did not *raise this spirit*, but rather Joel and St. Peter; according to whose words the *young men saw visions*, before Montanus was born.

You observe, fifthly, How Tertullian was "imposed upon by the ecstatic craft of visionaries," (p. 99,) and then fall upon Cyprian with all your might: your objections to whom we shall now consider.

And, first, you lay it down as a postulatum, that he was "fond of power and episcopal authority." I cannot grant this, Sir. I must have some proof; else this, and all you infer from it, will go for nothing.

You say, secondly, "in all questionable points of doctrine or discipline, which he had a mind to introduce into the Christian worship, we find him constantly appealing to the testimony of visions and divine revelations. Thus he says to Coecilius, that he was divinely admonished to mix water with wine in the sacrament, in order to render it effectual."

You set out unhappily enough. For this can never be a proof of Cyprian's appealing to visions and revelations in order to "introduce questionable points" of doctrine or discipline "into the Christian worship:" because this point was unquestionable, and could not then be "introduced into the Christian worship," having had a constant place therein, as you yourself have showed, (Introd. Disc. p. 57,) at least from the time of Justin Martyr. Indeed, neither Justin nor Cyprian use those words, *In order to render it effectual*. They are an ingenious and honest addition of your own, in order to make something out of nothing.

5. I observe you take much the same liberty in your next quotation from Cyprian. "He threatens," you say, "to execute, 'what he was ordered to do against them in vision.'" (p. 102.) Here also the last words, *in a vision*, are an improvement upon the text. Cyprian's words are, *I will use that admonition which the Lord commands me to use.** But neither was this in order to introduce any "questionable point," either of doctrine or discipline; no more than his "using the same threat to Pupianus," who had spoken ill of him and left his communion.

6. You go on, "He says likewise, he was admonished of God, to ordain one Numidicus, a confessor," (p. 103,) "who had been left for dead, half burnt, and buried in stones." (p. 104.) True, but what "questionable point of doctrine" or discipline did he introduce hereby? Or by ordaining Celerinus: "who was over-ruled, and compelled by a divine vision to accept that office." So you affirm

* Utar ea admonitione, qua me Dominus uti jubet. Epist. 9.

Cyprian says. But Cyprian says it not ; at least, not in those words which you cite in the margin ; which literally translated, run thus, *I recommend to you Celerinus, joined to our clergy, not by human suffrage, but by the divine favour.**

“ In another letter, speaking of Aurelius, whom he had ordained a reader, he says to his clergy and people, ‘ In ordaining clergy, my dearest brethren, I use to consult you first—But there is no need to wait for human testimonies, when the divine suffrage has been already signified.’ ”

An impartial man would wonder what you could infer from these five passages put together. Why, by the help of a short postulatum, “ He was fond of power,” (you have as much ground to say, *He was fond of bloodshed;*) you will make it plain, “ This was all a trick to enlarge his episcopal authority.” But as that postulatum is not allowed, you have all your work to begin again.

7. Hitherto then the character of Cyprian is unhurt ; but now you are resolved to blow it up at once. So you proceed, “ The most memorable effect of any of his visions was his flight from his church in the time of persecution.” (p. 104.) “ He affirms, that he was commanded to retire by a special revelation from heaven. Yet this plea was a mere fiction, contrived to quiet the scandal which was raised by his flight : and is confuted by himself, where he declares, it was the advice of Tertullus which prevailed with him to withdraw.” p. 105.

You here charge Cyprian with “ confuting himself,” in saying, “ He withdrew by the advice of Tertullus ;” whereas he “ before affirmed, that he was commanded to retire by a special revelation from heaven.” Indeed he had not : there is no necessity at all for putting this construction upon those words, “ The Lord who commanded me to retire ;” which may without any force be understood of the written command, ‘ When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another,’ (Matt. x. 23.) It is not therefore clear, that this plea of “ special revelation” was ever advanced. And if it was advanced, it still remains to be proved that “ it was nothing else but a mere fiction.”

8. Your citing his editor here, obliges me to add a remark, for which you give continual occasion. If either Rigalt, Mr. Dodwell, Dr. Grabe, Mr. Thirlby, or any editor of any of the Fathers, ever drops an expression to the disadvantage of the author whom he publishes or illustrates, this you account so much treasure, and will surely find a time to expose it to public view. And all these passages you recite as demonstration. These are doubtless mere oracles : although when the same person speaks in favour of the Father, his authority is not worth a straw. But you have “ none of those arts which are commonly employed by disputants to palliate a bad cause !” Pref. p. 31.

9. What you relate of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, you have

* *Non humana suffragatione, sed divina dignatione, conjunctum.* Epist. 34.

not from himself, but only from one who lived nearly a hundred years after Dionysius was dead. Therefore he is not at all accountable for it: as neither am I for any vision of St. Jerome. But I am concerned in the consequence you draw from it: "if this was a fiction, so were Cyprian's too." That will not follow. Many objections may lie against the one, which have no place with regard to the other.

10. You now bring forth your grand discovery, that "all the visions" of those days "were contrived, or authorized at least, by the leading men of the church. For they were all applied, either, 1. To excuse the conduct of particular persons, in some instances of it liable to censure; or, 2. To enforce some doctrine or discipline pressed by some, but not relished by others; or, 3. To confirm things not only frivolous, but sometimes even superstitious and hurtful." (p. 109.) Well, Sir, here is the proposition. But where is the proof? I hope we shall have it in your next *Free Inquiry*: and that you will then give us a few instances of such applications, from the writers of the three first centuries.

11. Being not disposed to do this at present, you fall again upon the poor "heretic Montanus: who first gave a vogue" (as you phrase it) "to visions and ecstacies in the Christian church." (p. 110.) So you told us before. But we cannot believe it yet; because Peter and Paul tell us the contrary.

Indeed you do not now mention Montanus, because it is any thing to the question, but only to make way for "observing," that those who wrote against him, "employed such arguments against his prophecy, as shake the credit of all prophecy. For Epiphanius makes this the very criterion between a true and a false prophet, 'That the true had no ecstacies, constantly retained his senses, and with firmness of mind apprehended and uttered the divine oracles.'" Sir, have you not mistook? Have you not transcribed one sentence in the margin, and translated another? That sentence which stands in your margin is this, "When there was need, the saints of God among the prophets prophesied all things with the true spirit, and with a sound understanding and reasonable mind." Now it is difficult to find out how this comes to "shake the credit of all prophecy."

12. Why thus, "Before the Montanists had brought those ecstacies into disgrace, the prophecy of the orthodox too was exerted in ecstacy. And so were the prophecies of the Old Testament, according to the current opinion of earlier days." p. 111.

That this was then the "current opinion," you bring three citations to prove. But if you could cite three Fathers more during the three first centuries, "expressly affirming," that the prophets were all out of their senses, I would not take their word. For though I take most of the Fathers to have been wise and good men, yet I know none of them were infallible. But do even these three affirm it? No: not one of them, at least in the words you have cited. From Athenagoras you cite only part of a sentence, which, trans-

lated as literally as it will well bear, runs thus, “Who, in an ecstacy of their own thoughts, being moved by the Divine Spirit, spoke the things with which they were inspired, even as a piper breathes into a pipe.” Does Athenagoras “expressly affirm” in these words, that the prophets were “transported out of their senses?” I hope, Sir, you do not understand Greek. If so, you show here only a little harmless ignorance.

13. From Justin Martyr also you cite but part of a sentence. He speaks (very nearly) thus: “That the Spirit of God, descending from heaven, and using righteous men, as the quill strikes the harp or lyre, may reveal unto us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things.” And does Justin *expressly affirm* in these words, that all the prophets were “transported out of their senses?”

Tertullian’s words are, “A man being in the spirit, especially when he beholds the glory of God, must needs lose sense.”* Now as it is not plain, that he means hereby lose his understanding, (it being at least equally probable, that he intends no more than losing, for the time, the use of his outward senses,) neither can it be said, that Tertullian *expressly affirms*, “The prophets were all out of their senses.” Therefore you have not so much as one Father to vouch for what you say was “the current opinion in those days.”

14. I doubt not but all men of learning will observe a circumstance, which holds throughout all your quotations. The strength of your argument constantly lies in a loose and paraphrastical manner of translating. The strength of mine lies in translating all in the most close and literal manner; so that closeness of translation strengthens mine in the same proportion as it weakens your arguments: a plain proof of what you elsewhere observe, that you use “no subtle refinements or forced constructions!” pref. p. 32.

15. But to return to Cyprian. “I cannot forbear,” you say; “relating two or three more of his wonderful stories.” (p. 112.) “The first is, A man who had denied Christ was presently struck dumb: the second, A woman who had done so was seized by an unclean spirit, and soon after died in great anguish: the third, of which he says he was an eye-witness, is this: The heathen magistrates gave to a Christian infant, part of what had been offered to an idol. When the deacon forced the consecrated wine on this child, it was immediately seized with convulsions and vomiting: as was a woman who had apostatized, upon taking the consecrated elements.” (p. 113.) The other two relations Cyprian does not affirm of his own personal knowledge. p. 115.

“Now what can we think,” say you, “of these strange stories, but that they were partly forged, partly dressed up in this tragical form, to support the discipline of the church in these times of danger and trial?” p. 115.

Why, many will think, that some of them are true, even in the manner they are related: and that if any of them are not, Cyprian

thought they were, and related them in the sincerity of his heart. Nay, perhaps some will think, that the wisdom of God might, "in those times of danger and trial," work things of this kind, for that very end, "to support the discipline of the church." And till you show the falsehood, or at least the improbability of this, Cyprian's character stands untainted: not only as a man of sense, (which you yourself allow,) but likewise of eminent integrity: and consequently, it is beyond dispute, that *visions*, the fifth miraculous gift, remained in the church after the days of the apostles.

Sect. V. 1. The sixth of the miraculous gifts which you enumerated above, namely, *the discernment of spirits*, you just name, and then entirely pass over. The seventh is, that of *expounding the Scriptures*. You tack to it, "or the mysteries of God." (p. 116.) But inasmuch as it is not yet agreed (as it was intimated above) whether this be the same gift, it may just as well be left out.

2. Now as to this, you say, "There is no trace of it to be found, since the days of the apostles. For even in the second and third centuries, a most senseless and extravagant method of expounding them prevailed. For which, when we censure any particular father, his apologists with one voice allege, "This is to be charged to the age wherein he lived, which could not relish or endure any better."

I doubt much, whether you can produce one single apologist for any "ridiculous comment on sacred writ," who any where "alleges, that the second or third century could not relish or endure any better." But if they were all to say this with one voice, yet no reasonable man could believe them. For it is notoriously contrary to matter of fact. It may be allowed, that some of these fathers, being afraid of too literal a way of expounding the Scriptures, leaned sometimes to the other extreme. Yet nothing can be more unjust than to infer from hence, "That the age in which they lived, could not relish or endure any but senseless, extravagant, enthusiastic, ridiculous comments on sacred writ."

Will you say, that all the comments on Scripture, still to be found, in the writings of Ignatius, Polycarp, Athenagoras, or even of Origen and Clemens Alexandrinus, are senseless and extravagant? If not, this charge must fall to the ground: it being manifest, that even "the age in which they lived," could both "endure and relish," sound, sensible, rational (and yet spiritual) comments on holy writ. Yet this extravagant charge you have repeated over and over in various parts of your work: thrusting it upon your reader in season and out of season. How fairly, let all candid men judge.

3. Touching the miraculous gift of expounding Scripture you say, "Justin Martyr affirms, it was conferred on him by the special grace of God." (p. 117.) I cannot find, where he affirms this. Not in the words you cite, which literally translated (as was observed before) run thus: 'He hath revealed to us whatsoever things we have understood by his grace from the Scriptures also.' You seem conscious, these words do not prove the point, and therefore eke them out with those of Monsieur Tillemont. But his own words, and no

other, will satisfy me. I cannot believe it, unless from his own mouth.

4. Meantime I cannot but observe an odd circumstance, that you are here, in the abundance of your strength, confuting a proposition which (whether it be true or false) not one of your antagonists affirms. You are labouring to prove, "There was not in the primitive church any such miraculous gift as that of expounding the Scriptures." Pray, Sir, who says there was? Not Justin Martyr: not one among all those fathers, whom you have quoted as witnesses of the miraculous gifts, from the tenth to the eighteenth page of your inquiry. If you think they do, I am ready to follow you, step by step, through every quotation you have made.

5. No, nor is this mentioned in any enumeration of the miraculous gifts which I can find in the Holy Scriptures. Prophecy indeed is mentioned more than once, by the Apostles as well as the Fathers. But the context shows, where it is promised as a miraculous gift, it means the foretelling things to come. All therefore which you say on this head, is a mere *ignoratio elenchi*, a mistake of the question to be proved.

Sect. VI. 1. The eighth and last of the miraculous gifts you enumerated, was, the gift of tongues. (p. 119.) And this, it is sure, was claimed by the primitive Christians; for Irenæus says expressly, 'We hear many in the church, speaking with all kinds of tongues.' "And yet," you say, "this was granted only on certain special occasions, and then withdrawn again from the apostles themselves: so that in the ordinary course of their ministry they were generally destitute of it. This," you say, "I have shown elsewhere." I presume, in some treatise which I have not seen.

2. But Irenæus, who declares, that "many had this gift in his days, yet owns, he had it not himself." This is only a proof that the case was then the same, as when St. Paul observed long before, *Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues?* (1 Cor. xii. 29, 30.) No, not even when those gifts were shed abroad in the most abundant manner.

3. "But no other father has made the least claim to it," (p. 120.) Perhaps none of those whose writings are now extant; at least, not in those writings which are extant. But what are these in comparison of those which are lost? And how many were burning and shining lights, within three hundred years after Christ, who wrote no account of themselves at all; at least none which has come to our hands! But who are they that "speak of it as a gift peculiar to the time of the apostles?" (ibid.) You say, "There is not a single father, who ventures to speak of it in any other manner." Well, bring but six Ante-nicene fathers, who speak of it in this manner, and I will give up the whole point.

4. But you say, "After the apostolic times, there is not in all history one instance, even so much as mentioned, of any particular person who ever exercised this gift." (p. 120.) You must mean, either that the Heathens have mentioned no instance of this kind,

(which is not at all surprising,) or that Irenæus does not mention the names of those many persons who in his time exercised this gift. And this also may be allowed without affecting in any wise the credibility of his testimony concerning them.

5. I must take notice here of another of your postulatums, which leads you into many mistakes. With regard to past ages, you continually take this for granted, "What is not recorded, was not done." But this is by no means a self-evident axiom. Nay, possibly it is not true. For there may be many reasons in the depth of the wisdom of God, for his doing many things at various times and places, either by his natural or supernatural power, which were never recorded at all. And abundantly more were recorded once, and that with the fullest evidence, whereof nevertheless we find no certain evidence now, at the distance of fourteen hundred years.

6. Perhaps this may obtain in the very case before us. Many may have spoken with new tongues, of whom this is not recorded: at least the records are lost, in a course of so many hundreds of years. Nay, it is not only possible that it may be so, but it is absolutely certain that it is so. And you yourself must acknowledge it. For you acknowledge, that the apostles, when in strange countries, spoke with strange tongues: that St. John, for instance, when in Asia Minor, St. Peter, when in Italy, (if he was really there,) and the other apostles, when in other countries, in Parthia, Media, Phrygia, Pamphylia, spoke each to the natives of each in their own tongues, the wonderful works of God. And yet there is no authentic record of this: "There is not in all history, one well attested instance of any particular apostle's exercising this gift in any country whatsoever." Now, Sir, if your axiom were allowed, what would be the consequence? Even that the apostles themselves no more spoke with tongues than any of their successors.

7. I need therefore take no trouble about your subsequent reasonings, seeing they are built on such a foundation. Only I must observe an historical mistake which occurs toward the bottom of your next page. Since the reformation, you say, "This gift has never once been heard of, or pretended to by the Romanists themselves." (p. 122.) But has it been *pretended to* (whether justly or not) by no others, though not by the Romanists? Has it never once been heard of" since that time? Sir, your memory fails you again. It has undoubtedly been "pretended to," and that at no great distance either from our time or country. It has been "heard of" more than *once*, no farther off than the valleys of Dauphiny. Nor is it yet fifty years ago, since the Protestant inhabitants of those valleys so loudly *pretended to* this and other miraculous powers, as to give much disturbance to Paris itself. And how did the king of France confute that pretence, and prevent its being heard any more? Not by the pen of his scholars, but by (a truly Heathen way) the swords and bayonets of his dragoons.

8. You close this head with a very extraordinary thought. "The gift of tongues may," you say, "be considered as a proper test or

criterion for determining the miraculous pretensions of all churches. If among their extraordinary gifts they cannot show us this, they have none to show which are genuine." p. 122.

Now I really thought it had been otherwise. I thought it had been an adjudged rule in the case, *All these worketh one and the self-same spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.* And as to every man, so to every church, every collective body of men. But if this be so, then yours is no proper test, for determining the pretensions of all churches: seeing he who worketh as he will, may (with *your* good leave) give the gift of tongues, where he gives no other: and may see abundant reasons so to do, whether you and I see them or not. For perhaps we have not always *known the mind of the Lord*; not being of the number of his counsellors. On the other hand, he may see good to give many other gifts, where it is not his will to bestow this. Particularly where it would be of no use: as in a church where all are of one mind, and all speak the same language.

9. You have now finished (after a fashion) what you proposed to do in the fourth place, which was, "to review all the several kinds of miraculous gifts, which are pretended to have been in the primitive church." Indeed, you have dropped one or two of them by the way; against the rest you have brought forth your strong reasons. Those reasons have been coolly examined. And now let every impartial man, every person of true and unbiased reason, calmly consider and judge, whether you have made out one point of all that you took in hand? And whether some miracles of each kind may not have been wrought in the ancient church, for any thing you have advanced to the contrary?

10. From the 127th to the 158th page, you relate miracles said to be wrought in the fourth century. I have no concern with these; but I must weigh an argument which you intermix therewith again and again. It is in substance this: "If we cannot believe the miracles attested by the later Fathers, then we ought not to believe those which are attested by the earliest writers of the church." I answer, the consequence is not good: because the case is not the same with the one and with the other. Several objections, which do not hold with regard to the earlier, may lie against the later miracles; drawn either from the improbability of the facts themselves, such as we have no precedent of in holy writ; from the incompetency of the instruments said to perform them, such as bones, relics, or departed saints; or from the gross "credulity of a prejudiced, or the dishonesty of an interested relater." p. 145.

11. One or other of these objections holds against most of the later (though not the earlier) miracles. And if only one holds, it is enough; it is ground sufficient for making the difference. If therefore it was true, that there was not a single father of the fourth age, who was not equally pious with the best of the more ancient, still we might consistently reject most of the miracles of the fourth, while we allowed those of the preceding ages; both because of the far greater improbability of the facts themselves, and because of the incompetency of the instruments.

But it is not true, that “the fathers of the fourth age,” whom you mention, were equally pious with the best of the preceding ages. Nay, according to your account, (which I shall not now contest) they were not pious at all. For you say, “They were wilful, habitual liars.” And if so, they had not a grain of piety. Now that the earlier fathers were not such, has been shown at large, (though indeed you complimented them with the same character.) Consequently, whether these later fathers are to be believed or not, we may safely believe the former: who dared not to do evil that good might come, or to lie either for God or man.

12. I had not intended to say any thing more, concerning any of the miracles of the later ages. But your way of accounting for one, said to have been wrought in the fifth, is so extremely curious that I cannot pass it by.

The story, it seems, is this: “Hunneric, an Arian prince, in his persecution of the orthodox in Afric, ordered the tongues of a certain society of them to be cut out by the roots. But by a surprising instance of God’s good providence, they were enabled to speak articulately and distinctly, without their tongues. And so continuing to make open profession of the same doctrine, they became not only preachers, but living witnesses of its truth.” p. 182.

Do not mistake me, Sir. I have no design at all to vouch for the truth of this miracle. I leave it just as I find it. But what I am concerned with is, your manner of accounting for it.

13. And first, you say, “It may not improbably be supposed, that though their tongues were ordered to be cut to the roots, yet the sentence might not be so strictly executed, as not to leave in some of them such a share of that organ as was sufficient, in a tolerable degree, for the use of speech.” (p. 183.) So you think, Sir, if only an inch of a man’s tongue were to be neatly taken off, he would be able to talk tolerably well, as soon as the operation was over.

But the most marvellous part is still behind. For you add, “To come more close to the point. If we should allow that the tongues of these confessors were cut away to the very roots, what will the learned doctor say, if this boasted miracle should be found at last to be no miracle at all?” p. 184.

Say? Why, that you have more skill than all the *strolling wonder-workers* of the three first centuries put together.

But to the point. Let us see how you will set about it. Why thus: “The tongue,” as you justly, though keenly observe, “has generally been considered as absolutely necessary to the use of speech. So that to hear men talk without it, might easily pass for a miracle in that credulous age. Yet there was always room to doubt, whether there was any thing miraculous in it or not. But we have an instance in the present century, which clears up all our doubts, and entirely decides the question. I mean, the case of a girl born without a tongue, who talked as easily and distinctly as if she had had one; an account of which is given in the *Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences at Paris.*” ibid.

14. And can you really believe this? That a girl spoke *distinctly and easily* without any tongue at all? And after avowing this belief, do you gravely talk of other men's credulity? I wonder that such a volunteer in faith should stagger at any thing. Doubtless, were it related as natural only, not miraculous, you could believe, that a man might see without eyes!

Surely there is something very peculiar in this; something extraordinary, though not miraculous; that a man, who is too wise to believe the Bible, should believe every thing but the Bible! Should swallow any tale, so God be out of the question, though ever so improbable, ever so impossible!

15. "I have now," you say, "thrown together all which I had collected for the support of my argument," (p. 187,) a lame recapitulation of which you add with an air of triumph and satisfaction. (p. 188.) "I wish the Fathers, the ablest advocates which Popery itself can afford; for Protestantism, I am sure, can supply none whom they would choose to retain in their cause: none who can defend them without contradicting their own profession, and disgracing their own character; or produce any thing, but what deserves to be laughed at, rather than answered." p. 189.

Might it not be well, Sir, not to be quite so *sure* yet? You may not always have the laugh on your side. You are not yet infallibly assured, but that even *Protestantism* may produce something worth an answer. There may be some Protestants, for aught you know, who have a few grains of common sense left, and may find a way to *defend*, at least the *Antenicene fathers*, without "disgracing their own character." Even such an one as I, have faintly attempted this: although I neither have, nor expect to have any preferment; not even to be a *Lambeth chaplain*: which if Dr. Middleton is not, it is not his own fault.

V 1. The last thing you proposed was, "To refute some of the most plausible objections which have been hitherto made." To what you have offered on this head, I must likewise attempt a short reply.

You say, "It is objected, first, That by the character I have given of the Fathers, the authority of the books of the New Testament, which were transmitted to us through their hands, will be rendered precarious and uncertain." p. 190.

After a feint of confuting it, you frankly acknowledge the whole of this objection. "I may venture," you say, "to declare, that if this objection be true, it cannot hurt my argument. For if it be natural and necessary, that the craft and credulity of witnesses should always detract from the credit of their testimony: then who can help it? And if this charge be proved on the Fathers, it must be admitted, how far soever the consequences may reach." p. 192.

"If it be proved,"—Very true. If that charge against the Fathers were really and substantially proved, the authority of the New Testament would be at an end, so far as it depends on one kind of evi-

ience. But that charge is not proved. Therefore even the traditional authority of the New Testament is as firm as ever.

2. It is objected, you say, secondly, "That all suspicion of fraud in the case of the primitive miracles, is excluded by that public appeal and challenge which the Christian apologists make to their enemies the Heathens, to come and see with their own eyes the reality of the facts which they attest." p. 193.

You answer, "This objection has no real weight with any who are acquainted with the condition of the Christians in those days." You then enlarge (as it seems, with a peculiar pleasure) on the general contempt and odium they lay under, from the first appearance of Christianity in the world, till it was established by the civil power. p. 194—196.

"In these circumstances it cannot be imagined," you say, "that men of figure and fortune would pay any attention to the apologies or writings of a sect so utterly despised." (p. 197.) But, Sir, they were hated as well as despised; and that by the great vulgar as well as the small. And this very hatred would naturally prompt them to examine the ground of the challenges daily repeated by them they hated: were it only, that by discovering the fraud, (which they wanted neither opportunity nor skill to do, had there been any,) they might have had a better pretence for throwing *the Christians to the lions*, than because the Nile did not, or the Tiber did overflow.

3. You add, "Much less can we believe that the emperor or senate of Rome should take any notice of those apologies, or even know indeed that any such were addressed to them." (p. 197.) Why, Sir, by *your* account, you would make us believe that all the emperors and senate together were as "senseless, stupid a race of blockheads and brutes," as even the Christians themselves.

But hold. You are going to prove it too. "For," say you, "should the like case happen now, that any Methodist, Moravian, or French prophet," (right skilfully put together,) "should publish an apology for his brethren, addressed to the king and parliament; is it not wholly improbable, that the government would pay any regard to it?" You should add, (to make the parallel complete,) "or know that any such was addressed to them."

No? I conceive the improbability supposed lies wholly on the other side. Whatever the government of Heathen Rome was, (which I presume *you* will not deprecate,) the government of England is remarkable for tenderness to the very meanest subject. It is, therefore, not improbable in the least, that an address from some thousands of those subjects, how contemptible soever they were generally esteemed, "would not be totally disregarded by such a government." But that they should "not know that any such had been addressed to them," is not only improbable, but morally impossible.

If, therefore, it were possible for the Heathens to "have a worse opinion of the ancient Christians than we," you say, "have of our modern fanatics," still it is utterly incredible, that the Roman go-

vernment should not only "take no notice of their apologies," but not even know that any such were addressed to them.

4. "But the publishing books was more expensive then, than it is now. And, therefore, we cannot think the Christians of those days were able to provide such a number of them as was sufficient for the information of the public." p. 198, 199.

Nay, if they were not able to provide themselves food and raiment, they would be sure to provide a sufficient number of these: sufficient at least for the information of the emperor and senate, to whom those apologies were addressed. And how great a number do you suppose might suffice for them? How many hundreds or thousands of copies? I apprehend the emperor would be content with one. And one more would be needful for the senate. Now I really believe the Christians of those days were able to provide both these copies. Nay, and even two more; if it should have fallen out, that two or three emperors were on the throne: even though we should suppose, that in Tertullian's time there were but forty thousand of them in all Rome.

5. However, you plunge on: "Since then the Christians were not able to bear the expense of copying them," (whether the Heathens were disposed to buy them, or not, is at present out of the question,) "there is great reason to believe, that their apologies, how gravely soever addressed to emperors and senates, lay unknown for many years." There is no great reason to believe it from any thing you have advanced yet. You add, "especially when the publishing of them was not only expensive, but so criminal also as to expose them often to danger, and even to capital punishment." p. 199.

In very deed, Sir, I am sometimes inclined to suspect, that you are yourself related to certain ancient fathers, (notwithstanding the learned quotations which adorn your margin, who used to say, *Græcum est: non potest legi*. You lay me under an almost invincible temptation to think so upon this very occasion. For what could induce you, if you knew what he said, to place at the bottom of this very page, a passage from one of those apologists, Justin Martyr, which so clearly confutes your own argument? The words are, * *Although death be determined against those who teach, or even confess the name of Christ, we both embrace and teach it every where. And if you also receive these words as enemies, you can do no more than kill us.* Could danger then, or the fear of *capital punishment*, restrain those Christians from presenting these apologies? No: capital punishment was no terror to them, who daily offered themselves to the flames: till the very Heathen butchers themselves were tired with slaughtering them.

* Καὶ περ θανάτῳ ορισθέντος καὶ τῶν δίδυσκοντων, η ὅλως ομολογεύντων το ονόμα τῷ Χριστῷ, ημεῖς ἡμεῖς καὶ ασπαζόμεθα καὶ δίδυσκομεν. Εἴ δέ καὶ νησις ως εχθροὶ εντείνεσθε τοισθε τοισθε λαούσι, οὐασθε το φονεῖσι.

There can, therefore, no shadow of doubt remain, with any cool and impartial man, but that these apologies were presented to the most eminent Heathens, to the magistrates, the senate, the emperors. Nor, consequently, is there the least room to doubt of the truth of the facts therein asserted: seeing the apologists constantly defied their enemies, “to come and see them with their own eyes:” a hazard which those *crafty men* would never have run, had not the facts themselves been infallibly certain. This objection then stands against you in full force. For such a public appeal to their bitterest enemies must “exclude all reasonable suspicion of fraud, in the case of the primitive miracles.”

6. You tell us, it is objected, thirdly, “That no suspicion of fraud can reasonably be entertained against those who exposed themselves even to martyrdom, in confirmation of the truth of what they taught.”

p. 194.

In order to invalidate this objection, you assert, “That some of the primitive Christians might expose themselves to martyrdom, out of mere obstinacy; (p. 200.) others from a desire of glory; (p. 201.) others, from a fear of reproach; (p. 208.) but the most of all, from the hope of a higher reward in heaven; (p. 202.) especially as they believed, the end of the world was near, and that the martyrs felt no pain in death.” (p. 203, 204.) “All which topics,” you say, “when displayed with art, were sufficient to inflame the multitude to embrace any martyrdom.” p. 208.

This appears very plausible in speculation. But fact and experience will not answer. You are an eloquent man, and able to display any topic you please, with art enough. Yet if you were to try, with all that art and eloquence, to persuade by all these topics, not a whole multitude, but one simple credulous ploughman, to go and be shot through the head; I am afraid, you would scarce prevail with him after all, to embrace even that easy martyrdom. And it might be more difficult still to find a man, who either out of obstinacy, fear of shame, or desire of glory, would calmly and deliberately offer himself to be roasted alive in Smithfield.

7. Have you considered, Sir, how the case stood in our own country, scarce two hundred years ago? Not a multitude, indeed, and yet not a few, of our own countrymen then expired in the flames. And it was not a general persuasion among them, that martyrs feel no pain in death. That these had feeling, as well as other men, plainly appeared, in the case of bishop Ridley, crying out, “I cannot burn, I cannot burn,” when his lower parts were consumed. Do you think the fear of shame, or the desire of praise, was the motive on which these acted? Or have you reason to believe it was mere obstinacy that hindered them from accepting deliverance? Sir, “since human nature has always been the same, so that our experience of what now passes in our own soul, will be the best comment on what is delivered to us concerning others,” let me entreat you, to make the case your own. You must not say, ‘I am not one of the ignorant vulgar: I am a man of sense and learning.’ So were many

of them; not inferior even to you, either in natural or acquired endowments. I ask then, would any of these motives suffice to induce you to burn at a stake? I beseech you, lay your hand on your heart, and answer between God and your own soul, what motive could incite you to walk into a fire, but a hope full of immortality? When you mention this motive, you speak to the point. And yet even with regard to this, both you and I should find, did it come to a trial, that the hope of a fool, or the hope of a hypocrite, would stand us in no stead. We should find nothing else would sustain us in that hour, but a well-grounded confidence of a better resurrection; nothing less than the 'steadfastly looking up to heaven, and beholding the glory which shall be revealed.'

8. "But Heretics," you say, "have been martyrs." I will answer more particularly, when you specify who? and when? It may suffice to say now, whosoever he be, that rather than he will offend God, calmly and deliberately chooses to suffer death, I cannot lightly speak evil of him.

But Cyprian says, 'Some who had suffered tortures for Christ, yet afterwards fell into gross, open sin.' It may be so: but it is nothing to the question. It does not prove in the least, what you brought it to prove, namely, "That bad men have endured martyrdom." Do not evade, Sir, and say, "Yes, torments are a kind of martyrdom." True; but not the martyrdom of which we speak.

9. You salve all at last, by declaring gravely, "It is not my design to detract in any manner from the just praise of those primitive martyrs, who sustained the cause of Christ at the expense of their lives." (p. 112.) No. Who could ever suppose it was? Who could imagine it was your design to detract from the *just praise* of Justin, Irenæus, or Cyprian? You only desired to show, what their just praise was, namely, the *praise* of pick-pockets, of common cheâts and impostors. We understand your meaning, therefore, when you add, "It is reasonable to believe, that they were the best sort of Christians, and the chief ornaments of the church in their several ages." p. 113.

10. You conclude, "My view is to show, that their martyrdom does not add any weight to their testimony." Whether it does or not, "It gives the strongest proof," (as you yourself affirm,) "of the sincerity of their faith:" and consequently proves, "that no suspicion of fraud can reasonably be entertained against them." (ibid.) But this (which you seem to have quite forgot) was the whole of the objection: and, consequently, this, as well as both the former objections, remain in their full force.

11. It has been objected, fourthly, you say, That you "destroy the faith and credit of all history." (p. 114.) But this objection, you affirm, "when seriously considered, will appear to have no sense at all in it." p. 115.

That we will try. And one passage, home to the point, is as good as a thousand. Now, Sir, be pleased to look back. In your preface, (p. 9,) I read these words: "The credibility of facts lies

open to the trial of our reason and senses. But the credibility of witnesses depends on a variety of principles wholly concealed from us. And though, in many cases, it may reasonably be presumed, yet in none can it certainly be known."

If this be as you assert, (I repeat it again) then farewell the credit of all history: Sir, this is not "the cant of zealots:" you must not escape so: it is plain, sober reason. If "the credibility of witnesses" (of all witnesses; for you make no distinction) depends, as you peremptorily affirm, on a variety of principles "wholly concealed from us," and consequently, though it may be presumed in many cases, yet can be certainly known in none: then it is plain, all history, sacred or profane, is utterly precarious and uncertain. Then I may indeed presume, but I cannot certainly know, that Julius Cæsar was killed in the senate-house; then I cannot certainly know, that there was an emperor in Germany, called Charles the fifth; that Leo the tenth ever sat in the see of Rome, or Lewis the fourteenth on the throne of France. Now let any man of common understanding judge, whether this objection has any sense in it, or not.

12. Under this same head, you fall again upon the case of witchcraft, and say, "There is not in all history, any one miraculous fact, so authentically attested as the existence of witches. All Christian" (yea and all Heathen) "nations whatsoever, have consented in the belief of them. Now to deny the reality of facts so solemnly attested and so universally believed, seems to give the lie to the sense and experience of all Christendom; to the wisest and best of every nation, and to public monuments subsisting to our own times." p. 221.

What obliges you then to deny it? You answer, "the incredibility of the thing." O Sir, never strain at the incredibility of this, after you have swallowed—a hundred people talking without tongues.

13. What you aim at in this, also, is plain, as well as in your account of the *Abbe de Paris*: the point of your argument is, "If you cannot believe these, then you ought not to believe the Bible: The incredibility of the things related ought to over-rule all testimony whatsoever."

Your argument, at length, would run thus: "If things be incredible in themselves, then this incredibility ought to over-rule all testimony concerning them. But the gospel-miracles are incredible in themselves." Sir, that proposition I deny. You have not proved it yet. You have only now and then, as it were by the by, made an attempt to prove it. And till this is done, you have done nothing, with all the pother that you have made.

14. You reserve the home stroke for the last. "There is hardly a miracle said to be wrought in the primitive times, but what is said to be performed in our days. But all these modern pretensions, we ascribe to their true cause, the craft of a few, playing upon the credulity of the many, for private interest. When, therefore, we read of the same things done by the ancients, and for the same ends, of acquiring wealth, credit, or power: how can we possibly hesitate to impute them to the same cause of fraud and imposture?" p. 230.

The reason of our hesitation is this. They did not answer *the same ends*. The modern clergy of Rome do acquire credit and wealth by their pretended miracles. But the ancient clergy acquired nothing by their miracles, but to be *afflicted, destitute, tormented*. The one gain all things thereby ; the others lost all things. And this, we think, makes some difference. ‘Even unto this present hour,’ says one of them, (writing to those who could easily confute him, if he spoke not the truth) ‘we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place.—Being reviled, we bless ; being persecuted, we suffer it ; being defamed, we entreat. We are become as the filth of the world, as the offscouring of all things unto this day.’ 1 Cor. iv. 11—13.—Now, Sir, whatever be thought of the others, we apprehend such clergy as these, labouring *thus*, unto the death, for *such* credit and wealth, are not chargeable with fraud and imposture.

VI. I have now finished what I had to say with regard to your book. Yet, I think, humanity requires me to add a few words concerning some points frequently touched upon therein, which perhaps you do not so clearly understand.

We have been long disputing about Christians, about Christianity, and the *evidence* whereby it is supported. But what do these terms mean? Who is a Christian indeed? What is real, genuine Christianity? And what is the surest and most accessible evidence (if I may so speak) whereby I may know, that it is of God? May the God of the Christians enable me to speak on these heads, in a manner suitable to the importance of them!

Sect. I. 1. I would consider, first, Who is a Christian indeed? What does that term properly imply? It has been so long abused, I fear, not only to mean nothing at all, but, what was far worse than nothing, to be a cloak for the vilest hypocrisy, for the grossest abominations and immoralities of every kind, that it is high time to rescue it out of the hands of wretches that are a reproach to human nature : to show determinately, what manner of man he is, to whom this name of right belongs.

2. A Christian cannot think of the Author of his Being, without abasing himself before him : without a deep sense of the distance between a worm of earth, and him that sitteth on the circle of the heavens. In his presence he sinks into the dust, knowing himself to be less than nothing in his eye : and being conscious, in a manner words cannot express, of his own littleness, ignorance, foolishness. So that he can only cry out, from the fulness of his heart, ‘O God! What is man! What am I!’

3. He has a continual sense of his dependence on the Parent of Good, for his Being, and all the blessings that attend it. To him he refers every natural, and every moral endowment : with all that is commonly ascribed either to fortune, or to the wisdom, courage, or merit of the possessor. And hence he acquiesces in whatsoever appears to be his will, not only with patience, but with thankfulness. He willingly resigns all he is, all he has, to his wise and gracious

disposal. The ruling temper of his heart, is the most absolute submission, and the tenderest gratitude to his Sovereign Benefactor. And this grateful love creates filial fear : an awful reverence towards him, and an earnest care not to give place to any disposition, not to admit an action, word, or thought, which might in any degree displease that indulgent Power to whom he owes his life, breath, and all things.

4. And as he has the strongest affection for the Fountain of all Good, so he has the firmest confidence in him : a confidence which neither pleasure nor pain, neither life nor death can shake. But yet this, far from creating sloth or indolence, pushes him on to the most vigorous industry. It causes him to put forth all his strength, in obeying him in whom he confides. So that he is never faint in his mind, never weary of doing whatever he believes to be his will. And as he knows, the most acceptable worship of God, is to imitate him he worships, so he is continually labouring to transcribe into himself all his imitable perfections : in particular, his justice, mercy, and truth, so eminently displayed in all his creatures.

5. Above all, remembering that God is Love, he is conformed to the same likeness. He is full of love to his neighbour, of universal love ; not confined to one sect or party : not restrained to those who agree with him in opinions, in outward modes of worship ; or to those who are allied to him by blood, or recommended by nearness of place. Neither does he love those only that love him, or are endeared to him by intimacy of acquaintance. But his love resembles that of him, whose mercy is over all his works. It soars above all these scanty bounds, embracing neighbours and strangers, friends and enemies : yea, not only the good and gentle, but also the forward ; the evil and unthankful. For he loves every soul that God has made ; every child of man, of whatever place or nation. And yet this universal benevolence does in nowise interfere with a peculiar regard for his relations, friends, and benefactors ; a fervent love for his country ; and the most endeared affection to all men of integrity, of clear and generous virtue.

6. His love to these, so to all mankind, is in itself generous and disinterested ; springing from no view of advantage to himself, from no regard to profit or praise : no, nor even the pleasure of loving. This is the daughter, not the parent of his affection. By experience he knows, that social love, (if it mean the love of our neighbour,) is absolutely different from self-love, even of the most allowable kind. Just as different as the objects at which they point. And yet it is sure, that, if they are under due regulations, each will give additional force to the other, till they mix together never to be divided.

7. And this universal, disinterested love, is productive of all right affections. It is fruitful of gentleness, tenderness, sweetness ; of humanity, courtesy, and affability. It makes a Christian rejoice in the virtues of all, and bear a part in their happiness ; at the same time that he sympathizes with their pains, and compassionates their infirmities. It creates modesty, condescension, prudence, together

with calmness and evenness of temper. It is the parent of generosity, openness, and frankness, void of jealousy and suspicion. It begets candour, and willingness to believe and hope whatever is kind and friendly of every man ; and invincible patience, never overcome of evil, but overcoming evil with good.

8. The same love constrains him to converse, not only with a strict regard to truth, but with artless sincerity and genuine simplicity, as one in whom there is no guile. And not content with abstaining from all such expressions as are contrary to justice or truth, he endeavours to refrain from every unloving word either to a present or of an absent person : in all his conversation aiming at this, either to improve himself in knowledge or virtue, or to make those with whom he converses some way wiser, or better, or happier than they were before.

9. The same love is productive of all right actions. It leads him into an earnest and steady discharge of all social offices, of whatever is due to relations of every kind ; to his friends, to his country, and to any particular community whereof he is a member. It prevents his willingly hurting or grieving any man. It guides him into a uniform practice of justice and mercy, equally extensive with the principle whence it flows. It constrains him to do all possible good, of every possible kind, to all men : and makes him invariably resolved, in every circumstance of life, to do that and that only, to others, which, supposing he were himself in the same situation, he would desire they should do to him.

10. And as he is easy to others, so he is easy to himself. He is free from the painful swellings of pride, from the flames of anger, from the impetuous gusts of irregular self-will. He is no longer tortured with envy or malice, or with unreasonable and hurtful desire. He is no more enslaved to the pleasures of sense, but has the full power both over his mind and body, in a continued cheerful course of sobriety, of temperance, and chastity. He knows how to use all things in their place, and yet is superior to them all. He stands above those low pleasures of imagination, which captivate vulgar minds, whether arising from what mortals term greatness, or novelty, or beauty. All these too he can taste, and still look upward ; still aspire to nobler enjoyments. Neither is he a slave to fame : popular breath affects not him : he stands steady and collected in himself.

11. And he who seeks no praise, cannot fear dispraise. Censure gives him no uneasiness ; being conscious to himself, that he would not willingly offend, and that he has the approbation of the Lord of all. He cannot fear want, knowing in whose hand is the earth and the fulness thereof, and that it is impossible for him to withhold from one that fears him any manner of thing that is good. He cannot fear pain, knowing it will never be sent, unless it be for his real advantage ; and that then his strength will be proportioned to it, as it has always been in times past. He cannot fear death ; being able to trust him he loves with his soul as well as his body ; yea, glad to leave the corruptible body in the dust, till it is raised in-

corruptible and immortal. So that in honour or shame, in abundance or want, in ease or pain, in life, or in death, always and in all things he has learned to be content, to be easy, thankful, happy.

12. He is happy in knowing there is a God, an intelligent Cause and Lord of all, and that he is not the produce either of blind chance or inexorable necessity. He is happy in the full assurance he has that this Creator and End of all things, is a Being of boundless wisdom, of infinite power to execute all the designs of his wisdom, and of no less infinite goodness, to direct all his power to the advantage of all his creatures. Nay, even the consideration of his immutable justice, rendering to all their due, of his unspotted holiness, of his all-sufficiency in himself, and of that immense ocean of all perfections, which centre in God from eternity to eternity, is a continual addition to the happiness of a Christian.

13. A farther addition is made thereto, while in contemplating even the things that surround him, that thought strikes warmly upon his heart,

“ These are thy glorious works, Parent of Good.”

While he takes knowledge of the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and wisdom in the things that are seen, the heavens, the earth, the fowls of the air, the lilies of the field. How much more, while, rejoicing in the constant care which he still takes of the work of his own hand, he breaks out, in a transport of love and praise, ‘ O Lord, our Governor ! How excellent is thy Name in all the earth ! Thou that hast set thy glory above the heavens !’ While he, as it were, sees the Lord sitting upon his throne, and ruling all things well : while he observes the general Providence of God co-extended with his whole creation, and surveys all the effects of it in the heavens and the earth, as a well-pleased spectator ; while he sees the wisdom and goodness of his general government descending to every particular ; so presiding over the whole universe, as over a single person, so watching over every single person as if he were the whole universe : how does he exult, when he reviews the various traces of the Almighty Goodness, in what has befallen himself in the several circumstances and changes of his own life ! All which, he now sees, have been allotted to him, and dealt out in number, weight, and measure. With what triumph of soul, in surveying either the general or particular Providence of God, does he observe every line pointing out an hereafter, every scene opening into eternity.

14. He is peculiarly and inexpressibly happy, in the clearest and fullest conviction, ‘ This all-powerful, all-wise, all-gracious Being, this Governor of all, loves me. This lover of my soul is always with me, is never absent, no not for a moment. And I love him ; there is none in heaven but thee, none on earth that I desire beside thee ! And he has given me to resemble himself, he has stamped his image on my heart. And I live unto him ; I do only his will ; I glorify him with my body and my spirit. And it will not be long before I shall die unto him ; I shall die into the arms of God. And

then, farewell sin and pain ; then it only remains, that I should live with him for ever.'

15. This is the plain, naked portraiture of a Christian. But, be not prejudiced against him for his name. Forgive his particularities of opinion, and (what you think) superstitious modes of worship. These are circumstances but of small concern ; and do not enter into the essence of his character. Cover them with a veil of love, and look at the substance ; his tempers, his holiness, his happiness.

Can calm reason conceive either a more amiable or a more desirable character ? Is it your own ? Away with names ! Away with opinions ! I care not what you are called. I ask not, (it does not deserve a thought,) what opinion you are of ; so you are conscious to yourself, that you are the man, whom I have been (however faintly) describing.

Do not you know, you ought to be such ? Is the Governor of the world well pleased that you are not ? Do you (at least) desire it ? I would to God that desire may penetrate your inmost soul ; and that you may have no rest in your spirit, till you are not only almost, but altogether a Christian !

Sect. II. 1. The second point to be considered is, What is real, genuine Christianity ? Whether we speak of it as a principle in the soul, or as a scheme or system of doctrine.

Christianity, taken in the latter sense, is, that system of doctrine, which describes the character above recited, which promises, it shall be mine, (provided I will not rest till I attain,) and which tells me how I may attain it.

2. First, It *describes* this character, in all its parts, and that in the most lively and affecting manner. The main lines of this picture are beautifully drawn in many passages of the Old Testament. These are filled up in the New, retouched and finished with all the art of God. The same we have in miniature more than once ; particularly in the thirteenth chapter of the former epistle to the Corinthians, and in that discourse which St. Matthew records, as delivered by our Lord, at his entrance upon his public ministry.

3. Secondly, Christianity *promises* this character shall be mine, if I will not rest till I attain it. This is promised in the Old Testament and New. Indeed the New is, in effect, all a promise ; seeing every description of the servants of God mentioned therein, has the nature of a command ; in consequence of those general injunctions, 'Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ.' 1 Cor. xi. 1. 'Be ye followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises.' Heb. vi. 12. And every command has the force of a promise, in virtue of those general promises : 'A new heart will I give you, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.' Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27. 'This is the covenant that I will make after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts.' Heb. viii. 10. Accordingly, when it is said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and

with all thy mind ;' it is not only a direction what I shall do, but a promise of what God will do in me ; exactly equivalent with what is written elsewhere, ' The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed (alluding to the custom then in use) to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul.' Deut. xxx. 6.

4. This being observed, it will readily appear to every serious person, who reads the New Testament with that care, which the importance of the subject demands, that every particular branch of the preceding character is manifestly promised therein ; either explicitly, under the very form of a promise, or virtually, under that of description or command.

5. Christianity tells me, in the third place, how I may attain the promise, namely, by faith. But what is faith ? Not an opinion, no more than it is a form of words ; not any number of opinions put together, be they ever so true. A string of opinions is no more Christian faith, than a string of beads is Christian holiness.

It is not an assent to any opinion, or any number of opinions. A man may assent to three, or three and twenty creeds ; he may assent to all the Old and New Testament, (at least, as far as he understands them,) and yet have no Christian faith at all.

6. The faith by which the promise is attained is represented by Christianity, as a power wrought by the Almighty in an immortal spirit, inhabiting a house of clay, to see through that veil into the world of spirits, into things invisible and eternal : a power to discern those things which with eyes of flesh and blood no man hath seen or can see ; either by reason of their nature, which (though they surround us on every side,) is not perceptible by these gross senses ; or by reason of their distance, as being yet afar off in the bosom of eternity.

7. This is Christian faith in the general notion of it. In its more particular notion it is, a divine evidence or conviction wrought in the heart, that God is reconciled to *me* through his Son : inseparably joined with a confidence in him, as a gracious, reconciled Father, as for all things, so especially for all those good things which are invisible and eternal.

To believe (in the Christian sense) is then to walk in the light of eternity : and to have a clear sight of, and confidence in the Most High, reconciled to me through the Son of his love.

8. Now how highly desirable is such a faith, were it only on its own account ! For how little does the wisest of men know of any thing more than he can see with his eyes ! What clouds and darkness cover the whole scene of things invisible and eternal ! What does he know even of himself as to his invisible part ? What of his future manner of existence ? How melancholy an account does the prying, learned philosopher, (perhaps the wisest and best of all Heathens,) the great, the venerable Marcus Antoninus give of these things ? What was the result of all his serious researches ? Of his high and deep contemplations ? " Either dissipation (of the soul as

well as the body, into the common, unthinking mass) or re-absorption into the universal fire, the unintelligent source of all things : or, some unknown manner of conscious existence, after the body sinks to rise no more." One of these three he supposed must succeed death, but which he had no light to determine. Poor Antoninus ! With all his wealth, his honour, his power ! With all his wisdom and philosophy !

" What points of knowledge did he gain ?
That life is sacred all—and vain !
Sacred how high ! And vain how low !
He could not tell—But died to know."

9. He died to know ! And so must you, unless you are now a partaker of Christian faith. O consider this. Nay, and consider not only how little you know of the immensity of the things that are beyond sense and time, but how uncertainly do you know even that little ! How faintly glimmering a light is that you have ! Can you properly be said to *know* any of these things ? Is that knowledge any more than bare conjecture ? And the reason is plain. You have no senses suitable to invisible or eternal objects. What *desiderata* then, especially to the rational, the reflecting part of mankind, are these ? A more extensive knowledge of things invisible and eternal : a greater certainty in whatever knowledge of them we have ; and, in order to both, faculties capable of discerning things invisible.

10. Is it not so ? Let impartial reason speak. Does not every thinking man want a window, not so much in his neighbour's, as in his own breast ? He wants an opening there, of whatever kind, that might let in light from eternity. He is pained to be thus feeling after God so darkly, so uncertainly ; to know so little of God, and indeed so little of any beside material objects. He is concerned, that he must see that little, not directly, but in the dim, sullied glass of sense ; and consequently so imperfectly and obscurely, that it is all a mere *enigma* still.

11. Now these very *desiderata* faith supplies. It gives a more extensive knowledge of things invisible, showing what eye had not seen, nor ear heard, neither could it before enter into our heart to conceive. And all these it shows in the clearest light, with the fullest certainty and evidence. For it does not leave us to receive our notice of them by mere reflection from the dull glass of sense ; but resolves a thousand enigmas of the highest concern, by giving faculties suited to things invisible. Oh ! Who would not wish for such a faith, were it only on these accounts ? How much more, if by this I may receive the promise, I may attain all that holiness and happiness !

12. So Christianity tells me ; and so I find it, may every real Christian say. I now am assured that these things are so ; I experience them in my own breast. What Christianity (considered as a doctrine) promised, is accomplished in my soul. And Christianity, considered as an inward principle, is the completion of all those

promises. It is holiness and happiness, the image of God impressed on a created spirit ; a fountain of peace and love springing up into everlasting life.

Sect. III. 1. And this I conceive to be the strongest evidence of the truth of Christianity. I do not undervalue traditional evidence. Let it have its place and its due honour. It is highly serviceable in its kind, and in its degree. And yet I cannot set it on a level with this.

It is generally supposed, that traditional evidence is weakened by length of time ; as it must necessarily pass through so many hands, in a continued succession of ages. But no length of time can possibly affect the strength of this internal evidence: It is equally strong, equally new, through the course of seventeen hundred years. It passes now, even as it has done from the beginning, directly from God into the believing soul. Do you suppose time will ever dry up this stream ? O no. It shall never be cut off.

Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.

2. Traditional evidence is of an extremely complicated nature, necessarily including so many and so various considerations, that only men of a strong and clear understanding can be sensible of its full force. On the contrary, how plain and simple is this ! And how level to the lowest capacity ! Is not this the sum, ‘ *One thing I know: I was blind, but now I see.*’ An argument so plain, that a peasant, a woman, a child, may feel all its force.

3. The traditional evidence of Christianity stands as it were a great way off ; and therefore although it speaks loud and clear, yet makes a less lively impression. It gives us an account of what was transacted long ago, in far distant times as well as places. Whereas the inward evidence is intimately present to all persons, at all times, and in all places. ‘ It is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, if thou believest in the Lord Jesus Christ.’ *This then is the record,* this is the evidence, emphatically so called, *That God hath given unto us eternal life; and this life is in his Son.*

4. If then it were possible (which I conceive it is not) to shake the traditional evidence of Christianity, still he that has the internal evidence, (and every true believer hath the witness or evidence in himself,) would stand firm and unshaken. Still he could say to those who were striking at the external evidence, ‘ Beat on the sack of Anaxagoras.’ But you can no more hurt *my* evidence of Christianity, than the tyrant could hurt the spirit of that wise man.

5. I have sometimes been almost inclined to believe, that the wisdom of God has, in most later ages, permitted the external evidence of Christianity to be more or less clogged and encumbered for this very end, that men (of reflection especially) might not altogether rest there, but be constrained to look into themselves also, and attend to the light shining in their hearts.

Nay, it seems, (if it be allowed for us to pry so far into the reasons of the divine dispensations,) that particularly in this age, God suffers

all kinds of objections to be raised against the traditional evidence of Christianity, that men of understanding, though unwilling to give it up, yet, at the same time they defend this evidence, may not rest the whole strength of their cause thereon, but seek a deeper and firmer support for it.

6. Without this, I cannot but doubt, whether they can long maintain their cause; whether, if they do not obey the loud call of God, and lay far more stress than they have hitherto done, on this internal evidence of Christianity, they will not, one after another, give up the external, and (in heart at least) go over to those whom they are now contending with; so that, in a century or two, the people of England will be fairly divided into real Deists and real Christians. And I apprehend this would be no loss at all, but rather an advantage to the Christian cause; nay, perhaps it would be the speediest, yea, the only effectual way of bringing all reasonable Deists to be Christians.

7. May I be permitted to speak freely? May I, without offence, ask of you that are called Christians, what real loss would you sustain in giving up your present opinion, that the Christian system is of God? Though you bear the name, you are not Christians; you have neither Christian faith nor love. You have no divine evidence of things unseen: you have not entered into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. You do not love God with all your hearts; neither do you love your neighbour as yourselves. You are neither happy nor holy. You have not learned in every state therewith to be content; to rejoice evermore, even in want, pain, death; and in every thing to give thanks. You are not holy in heart; superior to pride, to anger, to foolish desires. Neither are you holy in life: you do not walk as Christ also walked. Does not the main of *your* Christianity lie in your opinions? Decked with a few outward observances? For as to morality, even honest Heathen morality, (O let me utter a melancholy truth,) many of those whom you style Deists, there is reason to fear have far more of it than you.

8. Go on, gentlemen, and prosper. Shame these nominal Christians out of that poor superstition which they call Christianity. Reason, rally, laugh them out of their dead, empty forms, void of spirit, of faith, of love. Convince them, that such mean pageantry (for such it manifestly is, if there is nothing in the heart correspondent with the outward show) is absolutely unworthy, you need not say of God, but even of any man that is endued with common understanding. Show them, that while they are endeavouring to please God thus, they are only beating the air. Know your time; press on; push your victories, till you have conquered all that know not God. And then He, whom neither they nor you know now, shall rise and gird himself with strength, and go forth in his almighty love, and sweetly conquer you all together.

9. O that the time were come! How do I long for you to be partakers of the exceeding great and precious promise! How am I pained when I hear any of *you* using those silly terms, which the men

of form have taught you, calling the mention of the only thing you want, *Cant!* The deepest wisdom, the highest happiness, *Enthusiasm!* What ignorance is this! How extremely desppicable would it make you in the eyes of any but a Christian! But he cannot despise you, who loves you as his own soul, who is ready to lay down his life for your sake.

10. Perhaps you will say, "But this internal evidence of Christianity affects only those in whom the promise is fulfilled. It is no evidence to *me*." There is truth in this objection. It does affect them chiefly; but it does not affect them only. It cannot, in the nature of things, be so strong an evidence to others as it is to them. And yet it may bring a degree of evidence, it may reflect some light on you also.

For, first, You see the beauty and loveliness of Christianity, when it is rightly understood. And you are sure there is nothing to be desired in comparison of it.

Secondly, You know the Scripture promises, and says, It is attained by faith, and by no other way.

Thirdly, You see clearly how desirable Christian faith is, even on account of its own intrinsic value.

Fourthly, You are a witness, that the holiness and happiness above described can be attained no other way. The more you have laboured after virtue and happiness, the more convinced you are of this. Thus far then you need not lean upon other men: thus far you have personal experience.

Fifthly, What reasonable assurance can you have of things whereof you have not personal experience? Suppose the question were, Can the blind be restored to sight? This you have not yourself experienced. How then will you know that such a thing ever was? Can there be an easier or surer way than to talk with one or some number of men who were blind, but are now restored to sight? They cannot be deceived as to the fact in question; the nature of the thing leaves no room for this. And if they are honest men, (which you may learn from other circumstances,) they will not deceive you.

Now transfer this to the case before us; and those who were blind, but now see; those who were sick many years, but now are healed; those who were miserable, but now are happy, will afford you also a very strong evidence of the truth of Christianity: as strong as can be in the nature of things, till you experience it in your own soul. And this, though it be allowed they are but plain men, and, in general, of weak understanding; nay, though some of them should be mistaken in other points, and hold opinions which cannot be defended.

11. All this may be allowed concerning the primitive fathers: I mean particularly Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian; to whom I would add Macarius and Ephraim Syrus.

I allow that some of these had not strong natural sense, that few

of them had much learning, and none the assistances which our age enjoys, in some respects, above all that went before.

Hence, I doubt not but whoever will be at the pains of reading over their writings for that poor end, he will find many mistakes, many weak suppositions, and many ill-drawn conclusions.

12. And yet I exceedingly reverence them as well as their writings, and esteem them very highly in love. I reverence them because they were Christians, such Christians as are above described. And I reverence their writings, because they describe true, genuine Christianity ; and direct us to the strongest evidence of the Christian doctrine.

Indeed in addressing the Heathens of those times they intermix other arguments ; particularly that drawn from numerous miracles, which were then performed in the church ; which they needed only to open their eyes and see daily wrought in the face of the sun.

But still they never relinquish this ; “ What the Scripture promises I enjoy. Come and see what Christianity has done here : and acknowledge it is of God.”

I reverence these ancient Christians (with all their failings) the more, because I see so few Christians now ; because I read so little in the writings of later times, and hear so little of genuine Christianity : and because most of the modern Christians (so called) not content with being wholly ignorant of it, are deeply prejudiced against it, calling it enthusiasm, and I know not what.

That the God of power and love may make both them and you, and me, such Christians as those fathers were, is the earnest prayer of,

Rev. Sir,

Your real friend and servant,

JOHN WESLEY

Jan. 24, 1748-9.

A LETTER
TO THE
RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.
OCCASIONED BY HIS TRACT ON THE OFFICE AND OPERATIONS
OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

My Lord,

YOUR lordship well observes, “to employ *buffoonery* in the service of religion, is to violate the majesty of truth, and to deprive it of a fair hearing. To examine, men must be *serious*.” (Pref. p. 11.) I will endeavour to be so, in all the following pages. And the rather, not only because I am writing to a person who is so far, and in so many respects my superior, but also because of the importance of the subject. For is the question only, What I am? A madman, or a man in his senses? A knave, or an honest man? No: this is only brought in by way of illustration. The question is, of the Office and Operation of the Holy Spirit; with which the doctrine of the New-Birth, and, indeed, the whole of real religion, is connected. On a subject of so deep concern, I desire to be serious as death. But, at the same time, your lordship will permit me to use great plainness. And this I am the more emboldened to do, because by naming my name, your lordship, as it were, condescends to meet me on even ground.

I shall consider, first, what your lordship advances concerning me; and then what is advanced concerning the Operations of the Holy Spirit.

1. First, concerning me. It is true, I am here dealing in *crambe repetita*: reciting objections which have been urged, and answered a hundred times. But as your lordship is pleased to repeat them again, I am obliged to repeat the answers.

Your lordship begins, “If the false prophet pretend to some *extra-ordinary* measure of the Spirit, we are directed to try that spirit by James. chap. iii. 17.” I answer, 1. (as I have done many times before,) I do not pretend to any *extraordinary* measure of the Spirit. I pretend to no other measure of it than may be claimed by every Christian minister. 2. Where are we directed to *try prophets* by this text? How does it appear, that it was given for any such purpose? It is certain we may *try Christians* hereby, whether they are real or pretended ones. But I know not that either St. James or any other inspired writer, gives us the least hint of *trying prophets* thereby.

Your lordship adds, “In this rule or direction for the trial of spirits, the marks are to be applied only negatively. The man in whom

they are not found, hath not the wisdom from above. But we are not to conclude, that he has it, in whom any or all of them are found.” (p. 118.) We are not to conclude, that he is a prophet: for the apostle says nothing about prophets. But may we not conclude, the man in whom all these are found, has *the wisdom from above?* Surely we may: for these are the essential parts of that wisdom. And can he have *all the parts*, and not have *the whole?*

Is not this enough to show, that the apostle is here giving “a set of marks not to detect impostor-prophets,” but *impostor-Christians?* Those that impose either upon themselves or others, as if they were Christians, when they are not?

In what follows, I shall simply consider the argument, without directly addressing your lordship.

“Apply these marks to the features of modern fanatics, especially Mr. John Wesley. He has laid claim to almost every apostolic gift, in as full and ample a manner as they were possessed of old,” p. 119.

The *miraculous gifts* bestowed upon the apostles are enumerated in two places. First, ‘In my name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues: they shall take up serpents: if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.’ (Mark xvi. 17, 18.) Second, ‘To one is given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another faith, to another the gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discernment of spirits, to another tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues.’ 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, 10.

Do “I lay claim to *almost every one* of these, in as *full and ample* a manner as they were possessed of old?”

Five of them are enumerated in the former catalogue: to three of which, ‘speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents, drinking deadly things,’ it is not even pretended I lay any claim at all. In the latter, nine are enumerated. And as to seven of these, none has yet seen good to call me in question: *miraculous wisdom, or knowledge, or faith, prophecy, discernment of spirits, strange tongues, and the interpretation of tongues.* What becomes then of the assertion, that I lay claim to *almost every one* of them, in the most *full and ample* manner? Do I lay claim to *any one* of them? To prove that I do, my own words are produced, extracted from an account of the occurrences of about sixteen years.

I shall set them down naked and unadorned. 1. May 13, 1740, “The Devil stirred up his servants to make all the noise they could. 2. May 3, 1741, I explained to a vast multitude of people, ‘What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.’ The Devil’s children fought valiantly for their master, that his kingdom should not be destroyed. And many stones fell on my right hand and on my left. 3. April 3, 1740, Some or other of the children of Belial, had laboured to disturb us several nights before. Now all the street was filled with people,

shouting, cursing, swearing, and ready to swallow the ground with rage. (p. 120.) 4. June 27, 1747, I found only one person among them, who knew the love of God before my brother came. No wonder the Devil was so still: ‘for his goods were in peace.’ 5. April 29, 1753, I preached at Durham, to a quiet, stupid congregation. (p. 121.) 6. May 9, 1740, I was a little surprised, at some who were buffeted of Satan in an unusual manner, by such a spirit of laughter as they could in nowise resist. I could scarcely have believed the account they gave me, had I not known the same thing ten or eleven years ago, when both my brother and I were seized in the same manner. (If any man call this hysterics, I am not concerned: I think and let think.) 7. May 21, 1740, In the evening, such a spirit of laughter was among us, that many were much offended. But the attention of all was soon fixed on poor L— S—, whom we all knew to be no dissembler. One so violently and variously torn of the evil one, did I never see before. Sometimes she laughed till almost strangled; then broke out into cursing and blaspheming. At last she faintly called on Christ to help her. And the violence of her pangs ceased. (Let any one who please impute this likewise to hysterics. Only permit me to think otherwise.) 8. May 17, 1740, I found more and more undeniable proofs, that we have need to watch and pray every moment. Outward trials indeed were now removed. But so much the more did inward trials abound; and ‘if one member suffered, all the members suffered with it.’ So strange a sympathy did I never observe before, whatever considerable temptation fell on any one, unaccountably spreading itself to the rest: so that exceedingly few were able to escape it.” p. 122, 123.

I know not what these eight quotations prove, but that I believe the Devil still variously tempts and troubles good men; while he ‘works with energy in the children of disobedience.’ Certainly they do not prove that I lay claim to any of the preceding gifts. Let us see whether any more is proved, by the ten next quotations. 1. “So many living witnesses hath God given, that his hand is still stretched out to heal,” (namely, the souls of sinners, as the whole paragraph fixes the sense,) “and that signs and wonders are even now wrought,” (p. 124,) namely, in the conversion of the greatest sinners. 2. “Among the poor colliers of Placey, Jo. Lane, then nine or ten years old, was one of the first that found peace with God. (ibid.) 3. Mrs. Nowers said, her little son appeared to have a continual fear of God, and an awful sense of his presence.—A few days since (she said) he broke out into prayers aloud, and said, I shall go to heaven soon.” This child (when he began to have the fear of God) was (as his parents said) just three years old. 4. I did receive that “account of the young woman of Manchester from her own mouth.” But I pass no judgment on it, good or bad: nor, 5. On “the *trance*,” (p. 126,) as her mother called it, of S. T. neither denying nor affirming the truth of it. 6. “You deny that God does work those effects; at least that he works them in this manner: I affirm both. I have seen very many persons changed in a moment,

from the spirit of fear, horror, despair, to the spirit of love, joy, and praise. In several of them this change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to their mind, of Christ either on the cross, or in glory." p. 127.

"But here the symptoms of grace and of perdition are interwoven and confounded with one another." (p. 128.) No. Though light followed darkness, yet they were not interwoven, much less confounded with each other. 7. "But some imputed the work to the force of imagination, or even to the delusion of the Devil." (ibid.) They did so; which made me 'say, 8. 'I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God, by questioning his work.' (ibid.) 9. "Yet he says himself, these symptoms I can no more impute to any natural cause, than to the Spirit of God. I make no doubt, it was Satan tearing them as they were coming to Christ." (p. 129.) But *these symptoms*, and the *work* mentioned before, are wholly different things. The *work* spoken of is the conversion of sinners to God: these *symptoms* are cries and bodily pain. The very next instance makes this plain. 10. "I visited a poor old woman. Her trials had been uncommon: inexpressible agonies of mind, joined with all sorts of bodily pain: not, it seemed, from any natural cause, but the direct operation of Satan." p. 130.

Neither do any of those quotations prove that I lay claim to any miraculous gift.

"Such was the evangelic state of things, when Mr. W. first entered on this ministry: who seeing himself surrounded with subjects, so harmoniously disposed, thus triumphantly exults." To illustrate this, let us add the date. "Such was the evangelical state of things, Aug. 9, 1750." (On that day, I preached that *sermon*.) "when Mr. W first entered on this ministry." Nay, that was in the year 1738. So I triumphed, because I saw what would be twelve years after!

Let us see what the next ten quotations prove. 1. "In applying these words, 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,' my soul was so enlarged, that methought I could have cried out, (in another sense than poor, vain Archimedes,) Give me where to stand, and I will shake the earth." (p. 130.) I meant neither more nor less, (though I will not justify the use of so strong an expression,) than I was so deeply penetrated with a sense of the love of God to sinners, that it seemed, if I could have declared it to all the world, they could not but be moved thereby.

"Here then was a scene well prepared for a good actor, and excellently *fitted up* for the *part* he was to play." But how came so good an actor to begin playing the *part* twelve years before the scene was *fitted up*?

"He sets out with declaring his mission. 2. I cried aloud, 'All things are ready: come ye to the marriage.' I then delivered my message." And does not every minister do the same whenever he preaches? But how is this? "He sets out with declaring his mission!" Nay, but this was ten years *after* my *setting out*!

3. "My heart was not wholly resigned. Yet I know he heard my voice. 4. The longer I spoke the more strength I had: till at twelve, I was as one refreshed with wine. 5. I explained the nature of inward religion, words flowing upon me faster than I could speak. 6. I intended to have given an exhortation to the society. But as soon as we met, the Spirit of supplication fell upon us, (on the congregation as well as me,) so that I could hardly do any thing but pray and give thanks." (p. 132, 133.) I believe every true Christian may experience all that is contained in these three instances. 7. "The spirit of prayer was so poured upon us all, that we could only speak to God. 8. Many were seated on a wall, which, in the middle of the sermon, fell down; but not one was hurt at all. Nor was there any interruption, either of my speaking, or of the attention of the hearers. 9. The mob had just broke open the doors, and while they burst in at one door, we walked out at the other. Nor did one man take any notice of us, though we were within five yards of each other." (p. 133, 134, 135.) The fact was just so. I do not attempt to account for it; because I cannot. 10. "The next miracle was on his friends." They were no friends of mine. I had seen few of them before in my life. Neither do I say or think it was any miracle at all, that they were all "silent while I spoke;" or that "the moment I had done, the chain fell off, and they all began talking at once."

Do any or all of these quotations prove that I "lay claim to *almost* every miraculous gift?"

Will the eight following quotations prove any more? 1. "Some heard perfectly well on the side of the opposite hill, which was seven-score yards from the place where I stood." (p. 135.) I believe they did, as it was a calm day, and the hill rose gradually like a theatre. 2. "What I here aver is the naked fact. Let every one account for it as he sees good. My horse was exceedingly lame. And my head ached much. I thought, cannot God heal man or beast, by means, or without? Immediately my weariness and headache ceased, and my horse's lameness in the same instant." (p. 136.) It was so: and I believe thousands of serious Christians have found as plain answers to prayer as this. 3. William Kirkman's case proves only, that God does what pleases him; not that I make myself either "a great saint, or a great physician." (p. 137.) 4. "R. A. was freed at once, without any human means, from a distemper naturally incurable." (p. 138.) He was: but it was before I knew him. So what is that to me? 5. "I found Mr. Lunell in a violent fever. He revived the moment he saw me, and began to recover from that time. Perhaps for this also was I sent." (ibid.) I mean, perhaps this was one end for which the providence of God brought me thither at that time. 6. "In the evening, I called upon Ann Calcut. She had been speechless for some time. But almost as soon as we began to pray, God restored her speech. And from that hour the fever left her. 7. I visited several, ill of the spotted fever, which had been extremely mortal. But God had said, 'Hitherto

shalt thou come.' I believe there was not one with whom we were, but he recovered. 8. Mr. Meyrick had been speechless and senseless for some time. A few of us joined in prayer. Before we had done, his sense and his speech returned. Others may account for this by natural causes. I believe this is the power of God." (p. 139.)

But what does all this prove? Not that I claim any gift above other men; but only that I believe God now hears and answers prayer, even beyond the ordinary course of nature. Otherwise the clerk was in the right, who (in order to prevent the *fanaticism* of his rector) told him, "Sir, you should not pray for fair weather yet; for the moon does not change till Saturday."

While the two accounts, (p. 143—146,) which are next recited, lay before me, a venerable old clergyman calling upon me, I asked him, 'Sir, would you advise me to publish these strange relations, or not?' He answered, 'Are you sure of the facts?' I replied, 'As sure as that I am alive.' 'Then,' said he, 'publish them in God's name, and be not careful about the event.'

The short of the case is this. Two young women were tormented of the Devil, in an uncommon manner. Several serious persons desired my brother and me to pray with them. We (with many others) did, and they were delivered. But where, mean time, were "the exorcisms in form, according to the Roman fashion?" I never used them. I never saw them. I know nothing about them.

"Such were the blessings which Mr. W *distributed* among his friends. For his enemies he had in store, the *judgments* of heaven." (p. 144.) Did I then ever *distribute* or profess to distribute these? Do I *claim* any such power? This is the present question. Let us calmly consider the eight quotations brought to prove it.

1. 'I preached at Darlaston, late a den of lions. But the fiercest of them God has called away, by a train of surprising strokes.' (ibid.) But not by me. I was not there. 2. 'I preached at R. late a place of furious riot and persecution: but quiet and calm, since the bitter rector is gone to give an account of himself to God. 3. Hence we rode to T——n, where the minister was slowly recovering from a violent fit of the palsy, with which he was struck immediately after he had been preaching a virulent sermon against the Methodists. 4. The case of Mr. W——n was dreadful indeed, and too notorious to be denied. 5. One of the chief of those who came to make the disturbance on the first instant, hanged himself. 6. I was quite surprised when I heard Mr. R. preach: that soft, smooth, tuneful voice, which he so often employed to blaspheme the work of God, was lost, without hope of recovery. 7. Mr. C. spoke so much in favour of the rioters, that they were all discharged. A few days after, walking over the same field, he dropped down, and spoke no more.' p. 145—147.

And what is the utmost that can be inferred from all these passages? That I *believe* these things to have been judgments. What if I did? To *believe* things are judgments is one thing; to *claim* a power

of inflicting judgments, is another. If indeed I *believe* things to be judgments which are not, I am to blame. But still this is not "claiming any miraculous gift."

But "you cite one who forbid your speaking to some dying criminals, to answer for their souls at the judgment seat of Christ." (p. 147.) I do; but be this right or wrong, it is not "claiming a power to inflict judgments."

"Yes it is; for these judgments are fulminated with the air of one who had the divine vengeance at his disposal." (ibid.) I think not: and I believe all impartial men will be of the same mind.

"These are some of the *extraordinary gifts* which Mr. W. claims." (p. 149.) I claim no *extraordinary gift* at all. Nor has any thing to the contrary been proved yet, so much as in a single instance.

"We come now to the application of this sovereign test, James iii. 17." But let us see that we understand it first. I beg leave to consider the whole. *Who is a wise and knowing man among you? Let him show his wisdom*, as well as his faith, by *his works* not by words only. *But if ye have bitter zeal and strife in your heart, do not glory and lie against the truth*: as if any such zeal, any thing contrary to love, could consist with true wisdom. *This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where bitter zeal and strife are, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom which is from above*, (which every one that hath is a real Christian, and he only,) *is first pure*, free from all that is earthly, sensual, devilish; *then peaceable, benign, loving, making peace; gentle, soft, mild, yielding, not morose, or sour; easy to be entreated*, to be persuaded or convinced, not stubborn, self-willed, or self-conceited; *full of mercy, of tenderness and compassion; and good fruits, both in the heart and life.* Two of these are immediately specified, *without partiality, loving and doing good to all, without respect of persons, and without hypocrisy*, sincere, frank, open.

I desire to be tried by this test. I try myself by it continually: not indeed whether I am a *prophet*, (for it has nothing to do with this,) but whether I am a *Christian*.

I. The present question then is, (not what is Mr. Law, or what are the Moravians, but) what is John Wesley? And, 1. Is he *pure* or not? "Not pure: for he separates reason from grace." (p. 156.) A wonderful proof! But I deny the fact. I never did separate reason from grace. "Yes, you do. For your own words are, the points we chiefly insisted on were four. 1. That *orthodoxy*, or *right opinion*, is at best but a very slender part of religion; if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all." p. 157.

After premising, that it is our bounden duty to labour after a *right judgment* in all things, as a *wrong judgment* naturally leads to wrong *practice*: I say again, *right opinion* is at best but a very *slender part* of religion, (which properly and directly consists in right tempers, words, and actions,) and frequently it is *no part* of religion. For it may be, where there is no religion at all: in men of the most abandoned lives: *yea in the Devil himself*.

And yet this does not prove, that I “separate reason from grace,” that I “discard reason from the service of religion.” I do continually “employ it to distinguish between right and wrong opinions.” I never affirmed, “this distinction to be of little consequence,” or denied, “the gospel to be a reasonable service.” p. 158.

But “the apostle Paul considered *right opinion*, as a full third part, at least, of religion. For he says, ‘the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth.’ By *goodness* is meant the conduct of particulars to the whole, and consists in habits and social virtue, and this refers to *Christian practice*. By *righteousness* is meant the conduct of the whole, to particulars, and consists in the gentle use of church authority. And this refers to *Christian discipline*. By *truth* is meant the conduct of the whole, and of particulars to one another, and consist in *orthodoxy* or *right opinion*; and this refers to *Christian doctrine*.” p. 159.

My objections to this account are, 1. It contradicts St. Paul. 2. It contradicts itself.

First, It contradicts St. Paul. It fixes a meaning upon his words, foreign both to the text and context. The plain sense of the text taken in connexion with the context, is no other than this. *The fruit of the Spirit*, (Eph. v. 9.) (rather *of the light*, which Bengelius proves to be the true reading,) opposite to *the unfruitful works of darkness*, mentioned (v. 11. ;) it consists in *all goodness, kindness, tender-heartedness*, (chap. iv. 32 ;) opposite to *bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, evil-speaking*, (v. 31 ;) *in all righteousness*, rendering unto all their dues; opposite to *stealing*, (v. 28 ;) and *in all truth*, veracity, sincerity, opposite to *lying*. (v. 25.)

Secondly, That interpretation contradicts itself; and that in every article. For, 1. If by *goodness* be meant the conduct of “particulars to the whole,” then it does not consist in habits of “social virtue.” For “social virtue” regulates the conduct of particulars, not so properly to the whole as to each other. 2. If by *righteousness* be meant the conduct of “the whole to particulars,” then it cannot consist in the gentleness of church-authority; unless church governors are the whole church, or the parliament the whole nation. 3. If by *truth* be meant, the conduct of the whole, and of particulars to one another, then it cannot possibly consist in “orthodoxy or right opinion.” For *opinion*, right or wrong, is not conduct. They differ *toto genere*. If then it be *orthodoxy*, it is not “the conduct of the governors and governed towards each other. If it be their *conduct* toward each other, it is not *orthodoxy*.”

Although, therefore, it be allowed, that right opinions are a great help, and wrong opinions a great hinderance to religion, yet till stronger proof be brought against it, that proposition remains unshaken, “right opinions are a slender part of religion, if any part of it at all.” p. 160.

As to the affair of the Abbe Paris, whoever will read over, with calmness and impartiality, but one volume of Monsieur Montgeron, will then be a competent judge. Mean time I would just observe,

that if these miracles were real, they would strike at the root of the whole papal authority; as having been wrought in direct opposition to the famous Bull *Unigenitus*. p. 161.

Yet I do not say, “Errors in faith have little to do with religion;” or that they “are no let or impediment to the Holy Spirit.” (p. 162.) But still it is true, that “God (generally speaking) begins his work at the heart.” (ibid.) Men usually feel *desires* to please God, before they know how to please him. Their *heart* says, “What must I do to be saved?” before they *understand* the way of salvation.

But see “the character he gives his own saints!” ‘The more I converse with this people the more I am amazed. That God hath wrought a great work is manifest, (by saving many sinners from their sins.) And yet the “main of them are not able to give a rational account of the plainest principles of religion.’ They were not able then, as there had not been time to instruct them. But the case is far different *now*.

Again, did I “give this character” even then, of the people called Methodists, in *general*? No, but of the people of a *particular* town in Ireland, where nine in ten of the inhabitants are Romanists.

“Nor is the observation confined to the people. He had made a proselyte of Mr. D. vicar of B. And to show he was no discredit to his master, he gives him this character; ‘He seemed to stagger at nothing, though as yet his understanding is not opened.’” p. 162.

Mr. D. was never a proselyte of mine; nor did I ever see him before or since. I endeavoured to show him, that we ‘are justified by faith.’ And he did not object; though neither did he understand.

“But in the first propagation of religion, God began with the understanding, and rational conviction won the heart.” (p. 163.) Frequently, but not always. The jailer’s *heart* was touched first, then he *understood* what he ‘must do to be saved.’ In this respect then there is nothing *new* in the present work of God. So the lively story from Moliere is just nothing to the purpose.

In drawing the parallel between the work God has wrought in England and in America, I do not so much as “insinuate, the understanding has nothing to do in the work.” (p. 165.) Whoever is engaged therein will find full employment for all the understanding which God has given him.

“On the whole, therefore, we conclude, that wisdom which divests the Christian faith of its truth, and the test of it, reason—and resolves all religion into spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures, cannot be the wisdom from above, whose characteristic is purity.” p. 166.

Perhaps so, but I do not “divest faith, either of truth or reason; much less do I resolve all into spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures.” Therefore, suppose *purity* here meant *sound doctrine*, (which it no more means than it does a sound constitution,) still it touches not *me*, who for any thing that has yet been said, may teach the *soundest doctrine* in the world.

2. "Our next business is to apply the other marks to these pretended sectaries. The first of these, purity, respects the nature of 'the wisdom from above,' or in other words, the doctrine taught." (p. 167.) Not in the least. It has no more to do with doctrine, than the whole text has with prophets. "All the rest concern the manner of teaching." Neither can this be allowed. They no farther concern either teaching or teachers, than they concern all mankind.

But to proceed. "Methodism signifies only the manner of preaching; not either an *old* or a *new* religion; it is the manner in which Mr. W and his followers attempt to propagate the plain old religion." (p. 168.) And is not this sound doctrine? Is this spiritual mysticism and ecstatic raptures?

"Of all men, Mr. W should best know the meaning of the term; since it was not a *nick-name* imposed on the sect by its enemies, but an appellation of honour bestowed upon it by themselves." In answer to this, I need only transcribe what was published twenty years ago.*

"Since the name first came abroad into the world, many have been at a loss to know what a Methodist is: what are the principles and practice of those who are commonly called by that name; and what are the distinguishing marks of the sect, 'which is every where spoken against.'

"And it being generally believed that I was able to give the clearest account of these things, (as having been one of the first to whom the name was given, and the person by whom the rest were supposed to be directed,) I have been called upon in all manner of ways, and with the utmost earnestness so to do. I yield at last to the continual importunity, both of friends and enemies; and do now give the clearest account I can, in the presence of the Lord, the Judge of heaven and earth, of the principles and practice whereby those who are called Methodists are distinguished from other men.

"I say, those who are called Methodists; for let it be well observed, that this is not a name which they take upon themselves, but one fixed on them by way of reproach, without their approbation or consent. It was first given to three or four young men at Oxford, by a student of Christ's Church; either in allusion to the ancient sect of physicians so called, (from their teaching, that almost all diseases might be cured by a specific method of diet and exercise) or from their observing a more regular method of study and behaviour than was usual with those of their age and station."

I need only add, that this *nick-name* was imposed upon us before this manner of preaching had a being. Yea, at a time when I thought it as lawful to cut a throat as to preach out of a church.

"Why then will Mr. W so grossly misrepresent his adversaries, as to say, that when they speak against Methodism, they speak against the plain, old doctrine of the Church of England?" (ibid.)

* Preface to The Character of a Methodist.

This is no misrepresentation. Many of our adversaries, all over the kingdom, speak against us, *eo nomine*, for preaching these doctrines, justification by faith in particular.

However, “a fanatic manner of preaching, though it were the doctrine of an apostle, may do more harm to society at least, than reviving old heresies, or inventing new. It tends to bewilder the imaginations of some, to inflame the passions of others, and to spread disorder and confusion through the whole community.” (p. 169.) I would gladly have the term defined. What is “a fanatic manner of preaching?” Is it field-preaching? But this has no such effect, even among the wildest of men. This has not “bewildered the imagination,” even of the Kingswood colliers, or “inflamed their passions.” It has not spread disorder or confusion among them, but just the contrary. From the time it was heard in that chaos,

Confusion heard the voice, and wild uproar,
Stood rul'd, and order from disorder sprung.

“But St. James, who delivers the test for the trial of these men's pretensions,”—(the same mistake still) “unquestionably thought a fanatic spirit did more mischief in the mode of teaching than in the matter taught: since of six marks, one only concerns doctrine, all the rest the manners of the teacher.” (p. 170.) Nay, all six concern doctrine as much as one. The truth is, they have nothing to do either with doctrine or manner.

“From St. Paul's words, ‘Be instant, in season, out of season,’ he infers more than they will bear; and misapplies them into the bargain.” (p. 171.) When and where? I do not remember applying them at all.

“When seasonable times are appointed for holy offices, to fly to unseasonable, is factious.” (p. 172.) But it is not clear, that five in the morning and seven in the evening (our usual times) are unseasonable.

We come now directly to the second article. “‘The wisdom from above is peaceable.’ But the propagation of Methodism has occasioned many and great violations of peace. (p. 173.) In order to know where the blame hereof lies, let us inquire into the temper which makes for peace. For we may be assured the fault lies not there, where such a temper is found.” Thus far we are quite agreed. “Now the temper which makes for peace is prudence.” This is *one* of the tempers which make for peace; others are kindness, meekness, patience. “This our Lord recommended by his own example. (p. 174—177.) But this Mr. W. calls ‘the mystery of iniquity, and the offspring of hell.’” (p. 178.) No, not this: not the prudence which our Lord recommends. I call that so, and that only, which the world, the men who know not God, style Christian prudence. By this I mean subtlety, craft, dissimulation; study to please man rather than God; the art of trimming between God and the world, of serving God and mammon. Will any serious man defend this? And this only do I condemn.

“But you say, ‘good sort of men, as they are called, are the bane of all religion.’” (p. 179, 180.) And I think so. By this good sort of men, I mean, persons who have a liking to, but no sense of religion: no real fear or love of God; no truly Christian tempers. “These steal away the little zeal he has, that is, persuade him to be peaceable.” No; persuade him to be like themselves; without love either to God or man.

“Again, speaking of one, he says, ‘Indulging himself in harmless company,’ (vulgarly so called,) ‘He first made shipwreck of his zeal, then of his faith.’ In this I think he is right. The zeal and faith of a fanatic are such exact tallies, that neither can exist alone. They came into the world together, to disturb society and dishonour religion.”

By zeal I mean the flame of love, or fervent love to God and man; by faith the substance or confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Is this the zeal and faith of a fanatic? Then St. Paul was the greatest fanatic on earth. Did these come into the world to disturb society and dishonour religion?

“On the whole, we find Mr. W by his own confession, entirely destitute of prudence. (p. 181.) Therefore it must be ascribed to the want of this, if his preaching be attended with tumult and disorder.” By “his own confession?” Surely no. Tis I confess, and this only: what is falsely called prudence, I abhor: but true prudence I love and admire.

However, “you set at naught the discipline of the church, by invading the province of the parochial minister.” (p. 182.) Nay, if ever I preach at all, it must be in the province of some parochial minister: “by assembling in undue places, and at unfit times.” I know of no times unfit for those who assemble. And I believe Hanham Mount and Rosegreen were the most proper places under heaven for preaching to the colliers in Kingswood: “by scurrilous invectives against the governors and pastors of the national church.” This is an entire mistake. I dare not make any “scurrilous invectives” against any man. “Insolencies of this nature provoke warm men to tumult.” But these “insolencies” do not exist. So that whatever tumult either warm or cold men raise, I am not chargeable therewith.

“To know the true character of Methodism.” The present point is, to know the true character of John Wesley. Now in order to know this, we need not inquire what others were, before he was born. All, therefore, that follows, (p. 184—186,) of old Precisions, Puritans, and Independents, may stand just as it is.

But “Mr. W wanted to be persecuted.” (p. 187.) As this is averred over and over, I will explain myself upon it, once for all. I never desired, or *wanted* to be persecuted.

Lives there who loves his pain?

I love, and desire to ‘live peaceably with all men.’ “But persecution would not come at his call.” However, it came uncalled: and

more than once or twice, it was not “mock persecution.” It was not only the huzzas of the mob : showers of stones are something more than huzzas. And whosoever saw the mob either at Walsal or Cork, (to instance in no more,) saw that they were not “in jest,” but in great earnest, eagerly athirst, not for sport, (as you suppose) but for blood.

But though I do not desire persecution, I expect it. I must, if I believe St. Paul ; ‘all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution,’ 2 Tim. iii. 12: either sooner or later, more or less, according to the wise providence of God. But I believe, ‘all’ these ‘things work together for good, to them that love God.’ And from a conviction of this, they may even ‘rejoice,’ when they are ‘persecuted for righteousness’ sake.’

Yet as I seldom “complain of ill treatment,” so I am never “dissatisfied with good.” (p. 188.) But I often wonder at it. And I once expressed my wonder, nearly in the words of the old Athenian, “What have we done, that the world should be so civil to us ??”

You conclude the head, “As he who persecutes, is but the tool of him that invites persecution,” (I know not who does,) “the crime finally comes home to him who sets the rioter at work.” (p. 191.) And is this all the proof, that I am not peaceable? Then let all men judge, if the charge be made good.

3. “The next mark of the celestial wisdom is, it is ‘gentle and easy to be entreated;’ compliant and even obsequious to all men.” And how does it appear, that I am wanting in this? Why, he is “a severe condemner of his fellow-citizens, and a severe exactor of conformity to his own observances.” Now the proof. 1. “He tells us this in the very appellation he assumes.” (p. 192.) Nay, I never assumed it at all. 2. But “you say, useless conversation is an abomination to the Lord. And what is this, but to withstand St. Paul to the face?” Why, did St. Paul join in, or commend useless conversation? I rather think, he reproves it. He condemns as *συπέρ λογος, putrid, stinking* conversation, all that is not good, all that is not ‘to the use of edifying,’ and meet to ‘minister grace to the hearers.’ Eph. iv. 29. 3. “Mr. W ‘resolved, never to laugh, nor to speak a tittle of worldly things,—though others may, nay must.’” Pray add that, which was the reason of my so resolving, namely, that I expected to die in a few days. If I expected it now, probably, I should resume the resolution. But be it as it may, this proves nothing against my being both *gentle* and *easy to be entreated*. 4. “He says Mr. G. was a clumsy, overgrown, hardfaced man.” (p. 194.) So he was. And this was the best of him. I spare him much in saying no more. But he is gone. Let his ashes rest. 5. “I heard a most miserable sermon, full of dull, senseless, improbable lies.” It was so, from the beginning to the end. I have seldom heard the like. 6. “The persecution at St. Ives” (which ended before I came; what I saw I do not term *persecution*) “was owing to the indefatigable labours of Mr. H. and Mr. S., gentlemen worthy

to be had in everlasting remembrance. Here he tells us, it is his purpose to gibbet up the names of his two great persecutors to everlasting infamy." (p. 195.) These gentlemen had occasioned several innocent people, to be turned out of their livelihood ; and others to be outraged in the most shocking manner, and beat only not to death. My purpose is, by setting down their names, to make others afraid so to offend. Yet I say still, " God forbid that I should *rail*, either at a Turk, infidel, or heretic." But I will bring to light the actions of such Christians, to be a warning to others. And all this I judge to be perfectly consistent with "the spirit of *meekness*." p. 196.

4. " The fourth mark is, Full of mercy and good fruits. Let us inquire into the mercy and good fruits of Mr. W " (p. 198.)

1. And, first, " He has no mercy on his opposers. They pass with him under no other title, than that of the Devil's servants, and the Devil's children." (ibid.) This is far from true. Many have opposed, and do oppose me still, whom I believe to be the children and servants of God. " We have seen him despatching the principal of these children of the Devil, without mercy, to their father." (p. 199.) No, not one. This has been *affirmed* over and over, but never proved yet. I " fling about no exterminating judgments of God;" I " call down no fire from heaven." " But it would be for the credit of those new saints, to distinguish between rage and zeal." That is easily done. *Rage* is furious fire from hell ; *zeal* is loving fire from heaven. 2. " If what has been said above does not suffice, turn again to Mr. W 's Journals. Mr. S. while he was speaking to the society against my brother and me, was struck raving mad." (p. 200.) He was so, before a hundred witnesses ; though I was the *last* to believe it. " But it seems, God is at length entreated for him, and has restored him to a sound mind." And is my *relating* this *fact*, an instance of " *dooming* men to *perdition* ? " 3. " John Haydon cried aloud, Let the world see the judgment of God." (p. 201.) He did. But let John Haydon look to that. It was he said so, not I. 4. " I was informed of an *awful providence*. A poor wretch, who was here the last week, cursing, and blaspheming, and labouring with all his might to hinder the word of God, had afterwards boasted, he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then. But on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried." (p. 202.) And was not this an *awful providence* ? But yet I do not " *doom* even him to *perdition* ." 5. " I saw a poor man, once joined with us, who wanted nothing in this world. A day or two before he hanged himself, but was cut down before he was dead. He has been crying out ever since, " God had left him, because he had left the children of God." This was *his* assertion, not *mine*. I neither affirm nor deny it. 6. The true account of Lucy Godshall is this. " I buried the body of Lucy Godshall. After pressing towards the mark for more than two years, since she had known the pardoning love of God ; she was for some time weary and faint in her mind, till I put her out of the

bands. God blessed this greatly to her soul, so that, in a short time, she was admitted again. Soon after, being at home, she felt the love of God in an unusual manner poured into her heart. She fell down upon her knees, and delivered up her soul and body into the hands of God. In the instant the use of all her limbs was taken away, and she was in a burning fever. For three days she mightily praised God, and rejoiced in him all the day long. She then cried out, Now Satan hath desired to have me, that he may sift me as wheat. Immediately darkness and heaviness fell upon her, which continued till Saturday the fourth instant. On Sunday the light shone again upon her heart. About ten in the evening, one said to her, 'Jesus is ready to receive your soul.' She said, Amen ! Amen ! closed her eyes, and died." Is this brought as a proof of my *inexorableness* ! Or of my "dooming men to perdition ?"

7. "I found Nicholas Palmer in great weakness of body, and heaviness of spirit. We wrestled with God in his behalf; and our labour was not in vain. His soul was comforted; and a few hours after he quietly fell asleep." A strange proof this likewise, either of *inexorableness*, or of "dooming men to perdition !" Therefore this charge, too, stands totally unsupported. Here is no proof of my *unmercifulness* yet.

"Good fruits come next to be considered, which Mr. Wesley's idea of true religion does not promise. He saith," (I will repeat the words a little at large, that their true sense may more clearly appear :) "in explaining those words, *the kingdom of God*, or true religion, *is not meats and drinks*, I was led to show, that religion does not properly consist in harmlessness, using the means of grace, and doing good, that is, helping our neighbours, chiefly by giving alms ; but that a man might both be harmless, use the means of grace, and do much good, and yet have no true religion at all." (p. 203.) He may so. Yet whoever has true religion, must be 'zealous of good works.' And zeal for all good works, is, according to *my* idea, an essential ingredient of true religion.

"Spiritual cures are all the good fruits he pretends to," (p. 204, 205.) Not quite all, says William Kirkman, with some others. "A few of his spiritual cures we will set in a fair light. The first time I preached at Swalwell," (chiefly to colliers and workers in the iron work,) "none seemed to be much convinced, only stunned :" I mean *amazed* at what they heard, though they were the first principles of religion. "But he brings them to their senses with a vengeance." No, not *them*. These were different persons. Are they lumped together, in order to set things in a *fair light* ? The whole paragraph runs thus. 'I carefully examined those who had lately cried out in the congregation. Some of these, I found, could give no account at all, how or wherefore they had done so: only that of a sudden, they dropped down, they knew not how: and what they afterward said or did, they knew not. Others could just remember, they were in fear, but could not tell what they were in fear of. Several said they were afraid of the Devil: and this was all they

knew. But a few gave a more intelligible account of the piercing sense they then had of their sins, both inward and outward, which were set in array against them, round about: of the dread they were in of the wrath of God, and the punishment they had deserved, into which they seemed to be just falling, without any way to escape. One of them told me, "I was as if I was just falling down from the highest place I had ever seen. I thought the Devil was pushing me off, and that God had forsaken me." Another said, "I felt the very fire of hell already kindled in my breast: and all my body was in as much pain, as if I had been in a burning fiery furnace." What wisdom is this, which rebuketh these, *that they should hold their peace?* Nay, let such an one cry after *Jesus of Nazareth*, till he saith, *Thy faith hath made thee whole.*"

Now follow the proofs of my driving men mad. 1. "Another of Dr. Monro's patients came to ask my advice. I found no reason to believe she had been any otherwise mad, than every one is, that is deeply convinced of sin." (p. 208.) Let this prove all that it can prove. 2. "A middle aged woman was really distracted:" Yes, before I ever saw her, or she me. 3. "I could not but be under some concern with regard to one or two persons, who were tormented in an unaccountable manner, and seemed to be indeed lunatic, as well as sore vexed." True; for a time. But the deliverance of one of them is related in the very next paragraph. 4. "Two or three are gone quite distracted: that is, they mourn and refuse to be comforted till they have redemption." (p. 209.) 5. "I desired one to visit Mrs. G. in Bedlam, put in by her husband, as a mad woman." But she never was mad in any degree, as he himself afterwards acknowledged. 6. "One was so deeply convinced of her ungodliness, that she cried out day and night, Lord, save, or I perish! All the neighbours agreed she was stark mad." But I did not make her so. For this was before she ever saw my face. Now let any one judge, whether here is yet a single proof, that I drive men mad.

"The time when this spiritual madness was at its height, he calls a glorious time." (p. 210.) I call that a glorious time when many notorious sinners are converted to God; (whether with any outward symptoms or none; for those are no way essential;) and when many are in the *triumph of faith*, greatly *rejoicing in God their Saviour*.

"But though Mr. Wesley does so well in turning fools into madmen, yet his craftmaster is certainly one Mr. Wheatley, of whom he gives this extraordinary account.

"A poor woman (on Wed. 17th Sept. 1740) said, it was four years (namely, in Sept. 1736, above a year before I left Georgia) since her son, by hearing a sermon of Mr. Wheatley's, fell into great uneasiness. She thought he was ill, and would have sent for a physician. But he said, "No, no; send for Mr. Wheatley." He was sent for, and came; and after asking a few questions, told her, "The boy is mad. Get a coach, and carry him to Dr. Munro. Use my name. I have sent several such to him. Who this Mr. Wheatley

is, I know not." (p. 211.) He was lecturer at Spitalfields church. The event was, after the apothecary had half murdered him, he was discharged, and the lad soon recovered his strength. His senses he never had lost. The supposing this, was a blunder from the beginning.

"These are the exploits which Mr. W calls blessings from God." (p. 212.) (Certainly I do, both *repentance* and *faith*.) "And which therefore we may call the good fruits of his ministry." (May God increase them a hundred fold!) "What the apostle calls good fruits, namely, doing much good, Mr. W tells us, belongs not to true religion." I never told any man so yet. I tell all men just the contrary.

I may then safely leave all mankind to judge, whether a single article of the charge against me has yet been made good. So much for the first charge, that I am a *madman*. Now for the second, that I am a *knave*.

5. The proof is short: "Every enthusiast is a knave: but he is an enthusiast. Therefore he is a knave." I deny both the first and second proposition. Nay, the first is proved thus: "Enthusiasm must always be accompanied with craft and knavery." (p. 213.) It often is so, but not always; for there may be *honest enthusiasts*. Therefore the whole account of that *odd combination* which follows is ingenious, (p. 214—218,) but proves nothing.

Yet I must touch upon one or two parts of it. "An enthusiast thinks he is dispensed with in breaking, nay, that he is authorized to break the common laws of morality." Does every enthusiast? Then am none: for I never thought any such thing. I believe no man living is authorized to break, or is dispensed with in breaking any law of morality. I know, whoever (habitually) breaks one of the east of these, *shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven*.

"Can any but an enthusiast believe, that he may use guile to promote the glory of God? Yes, ten thousand that are no enthusiasts, truly believe this. How few do we find that do not believe it? That do not plead for *officious lies*? How few will subscribe to St. Augustine's declaration, (to which I assent with my whole heart,) I would not tell a wilful lie, to save the souls of the whole world."

But to return, "The wisdom from above is without partiality and without hypocrisy. Partiality consists in dispensing an unequal measure in our transactions with others: hypocrisy, in attempting to cover that unequal measure by prevarication and false pretences." The former of these definitions is not clear; the latter, neither clear, nor adequate to be defined.

But let this pass. My partiality is now to the point. What are the proofs of it? 1. "His followers are always the children of God, his opposers the children of the Devil." (p. 220.) Neither so, nor so. I never affirmed either one or the other universally. That some of the former are children of God, and some of the latter children of the Devil, I believe. But what will this prove?

"His followers are directed by inward feelings, the impulses of

an inflamed fancy :" (no more than they are directed by the Koran) " his opposers, by the Scripture." What ! while they are cursing, swearing, blaspheming ; beating and maiming men that have done them no wrong, and treating women in a manner too shocking to be repeated ? 2. The next proof is very extraordinary. My words are, 'I was with two persons, who, I doubt, are properly enthusiasts: for, first, they think to attain the end without the means, which is enthusiasm properly so called. Again, they think themselves inspired of God, and are not. But also, imaginary inspiration is enthusiasm. That theirs is only imaginary inspiration appears hence, it contradicts *the law and the testimony.*' p. 221.

Now, by what art of man can this be made a proof of my *partiality* ? Why thus : "These are wise words. But what do they amount to ? Only to this : that these two persons would not take out their patents of inspiration from his office." But what proof is there of this round assertion ? Truly, none at all.

Full as extraordinary is the third proof of my partiality. "Miss Gr. told Mrs. Sp., Mr. W was a Papist. Upon this Miss Gr. is anathematized. And we are told, that in consequence, she had lately been raving mad, and as such was tied down in her bed. Yet all these circumstances of madness have befallen his favourite saints, whom he has vindicated from the opprobrium." p. 222.

The passage in my Journal stands thus : 'Mrs. Spa—— told me, two or three nights since, Miss Gr. met me, and said, I assure you, Mr. Wesley is a Papist. Perhaps I need observe no more upon this, than that Miss Gr. had lately been raving mad, in consequence of a *fever* ; (not of an *anathema*, which never had any being,) that as such she was tied down in her bed ; and as soon as she was suffered to go abroad, went to Mr. Whitefield, to inquire of him whether *she* was not a Papist. But he quickly perceived, she was only a lunatic, the nature of her disorder soon betraying it-self.' Certainly then my allowing *her* to be mad, is no proof of my partiality. I will allow every one to be so, who is attended with "all these circumstances of madness."

4. "He pronounces sentence of enthusiasm upon another, and tells us wherefore, without any disguise. Here I took leave of a poor, mad, original enthusiast, who had been scattering lies in every quarter." It was the famous John Adams, since confined at Box, whose capital lie, the source of the rest was, that he was a prophet, greater than Moses, or any of the apostles. And is the pronouncing him a madman a proof of my *partiality* ?

5. "I had much conversation with Mr. Simpson, an original enthusiast. I desired him in the evening to give an exhortation. He did so, and spoke many good things, in a manner peculiar to himself," (without order or connexion, head or tail : and in a language very near as mystical as that of Jacob Behmen.) "When he had done, I summed up what he had said, methodizing and explaining it. O what pity it is, this well-meaning man should ever speak without an interpreter." p. 223.

Let this passage likewise stand as it is, and who can guess how it is to prove my *partiality*? But by a slight of hand, the thing is done. "How differently does Mr. Wesley treat these two enthusiasts! The first is accused of spreading lies of his Master :" (No, he never was any disciple of mine.) "On which Mr. W took his leave of him; a gentle expression, to signify the thrusting him out head and shoulders, from the society of saints." It signifies neither more nor less, than that I went out of the room and left him. "The others enthusiasm is made to consist only in want of method." No. His enthusiasm did not *consist in this*. It was the cause of it. But he was quite another man than John Adams: and, I believe, a right honest man.

6. "I was both surprised and grieved at a genuine instance of enthusiasm. I. B., who had received a sense of the love of God a few days before, came riding through the town, hollowing, and shouting, and driving all the people before him, telling them, 'God had told him, he should be a king, and should tread all his enemies under his feet.' I sent him home immediately to his work, and advised him to cry day and night to God that he might be lowly in heart, lest Satan should again *get an advantage over him*."

What this proves, or is intended to prove, I cannot tell. Certainly neither this, nor any of the preceding pages, prove the point now in question, my *partiality*. So this likewise is wholly unproved still.

"We shall end where every frantic leader ends, with his hypocrisy." (p. 227.) Five arguments are brought in proof of this. I shall take them in their order. 1. "After having heaped up miracles one upon another, he sneaks away under the protection of a puny wonder. 'About five I began near the keelman's hospital, many thousands standing round. The wind was high just before, but scarcely a breath was felt all the time we assembled before God. I praise God for this also. Is it enthusiasm, to see God in every benefit we receive? It is not; the enthusiasm consists in believing those benefits to be conferred, through a change in the established course of nature. But here he insinuates, that he meant no more by his miracles, than the seeing God in every benefit we receive.'" (p. 228, 229.) That sudden and total ceasing of the wind, I impute to the *particular providence of God*. This I mean by *seeing God* therein. But this I knew many would count *enthusiasm*. In guarding against it, I had an eye to that single incident, and no other. Nor did I *insinuate* any thing more than I expressed, in as plain a manner as I could.

A little digression follows. "A friend of his advises, not to establish the power of working miracles, as the great criterion of a divine mission: seeing the agreement of doctrines with Scripture, is the only infallible rule." (p. 230.) "But Christ himself establishes the power of working miracles, as the great criterion of a divine mission." (p. 231.) True, of a mission to be the Saviour of the world: to put a period to the Jewish, and introduce the Christian

dispensation. And whoever pretends to such a mission, will stand in such need of such credentials.

2. "He shifts and doubles no less" (neither less nor more) "as to the ecstacies of his saints. Sometimes they are of God, sometimes of the Devil; but he is constant in this, that natural causes have no hand in them." This is not true. In what are here termed *ecstacies*, strong joy or grief, attended with various bodily symptoms, I have openly affirmed again and again, that *natural causes* have a part. Nor did I ever shift or double on the head. I have steadily and uniformly maintained, that if the mind be affected to such a degree, the body must be affected by the laws of the vital union. The mind I believe was, in many of those cases, affected by the Spirit of God, in others by the Devil, and in some by both: and in consequence of this, the body was affected also. 3. "Mr. Wesley says, I fear we have grieved the Spirit of the jealous God, by questioning his work, and by blaspheming it, by imputing it to nature, or even to the Devil." (p. 232, 233.) True; by imputing the conviction and conversion of sinners, which is the work of God alone, (because of these unusual circumstances attending it,) either to nature or to the Devil. This is flat and plain. No *prevarication* yet. Let us attend to the next proof of it. "Innumerable cautions were given me, not to regard visions or dreams, or to fancy people had remissions of sins, because of their cries, or tears, or outward professions. The sum of my answer was, You deny that God does now work these effects; at least, that he works them in this manner. I affirm both. I have seen very many persons changed in a moment from a spirit of fear, horror, despair, to a spirit of love, joy, peace.—What I have to say touching visions and dreams, is this: I know several persons in whom this great change was wrought in a dream, or during a strong representation to the eye of their mind, of Christ, either on the cross, or in glory. This is the fact. Let any judge of it as they please. And that such a change was then wrought, appears (not from their shedding tears only, or falling into fits, or crying out: these are not the fruits, as you seem to suppose, whereby I judge, but) from the whole tenor of their life, till then many ways wicked, from that time holy, and just, and good." "Nay, he is so convinced of its being the work of God, that the horrid blasphemies which ensued, he ascribes to the abundance of joy which God had given to a poor, mad woman." (p. 234.) Do I ascribe those *blasphemies* to her *joy in God*? No; but to her *pride*. My words are, 'I met with one, who, having been *lifted up* with the abundance of joy which God had given her, had fallen into such blasphemies and vain imaginations, as are not common to men. In the afternoon I found another instance, nearly I fear, of the same kind: one who set her *private revelations*, so called, on the self-same foot with the written word.' p. 235.

But how is this to prove *prevarication*? "Why, on a sudden, he directly revokes all he had advanced. He says, 'I told them, they were not to judge of the spirit whereby any one spoke, either by appearances, or by common report, or by their own inward feelings.

No, nor by any dreams, visions, or revelations, supposed to be made to the soul, any more than by their tears, or any involuntary effects wrought upon their bodies. I warned them, that all these things were in themselves of a doubtful, disputable nature. They might be from God, or they might not; and were therefore not simply to be relied on, any more than simply to be condemned, but to be tried by a farther rule, to be brought to the only certain test, the law and the testimony." "Now is not this a formal recantation of what he had said just above?" (p. 335.) Nothing less, as I will show in two minutes, to every calm, impartial man. What I say now, I have said any time these thirty years: I have never varied therefrom for an hour. 'Every thing disputable is to be brought to the only certain test, the law and the testimony.' "But did not you talk just now of visions and dreams?" Yes; but not as of a *test* of any thing; only as a *channel* through which God is sometimes pleased to convey 'love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance,' the indisputable *fruit* of his Spirit. And these we may observe, wherever they exist, must be *inwardly felt*. Now, where is the *prevarication*? Where the *formal recantation*? They are vanished into air.

But here is more proof: "At length he gives up all these divine agitations to the Devil. (p. 236.) I inquired, says he, into the case of those who had lately cried out aloud during the preaching. I found this had come upon every one of them in a moment, without any previous notice. In that moment they dropped down, lost all their strength, and were seized with violent pain. Some said they felt as if a sword were running through them: others as if their whole body were tearing in pieces. These symptoms I can no more impute to any natural cause, than to the Spirit of God. I make no doubt but it was Satan tearing them as they were coming to Christ." p. 237.

"Now these were the *very symptoms* which he had before ascribed to the Spirit of God." Never in my life. Indeed some of them I never met with before. Those outward *symptoms* which I had met with before, bodily agitations in particular, I did not ascribe to the Spirit of God, but to the *natural union* of the soul and body. And those symptoms which I now ascribe to the Devil, I never ascribed to any other cause. The second proof of my *prevarication* or *hypocrisy* is therefore just as conclusive as the first.

3. Now for the third. "Mr. W before spoke contemptuously of orthodoxy, to take in the sectaries. But when he would take off churchmen, then orthodoxy is the *unum necessarium*." Did I ever say so? No more than (in the other extreme) *speak contemptuously* of it. "Yes, you say, I described the plain, old religion of the Church of England, which is now almost every where spoken against, under the new name of *Methodism*." Very well: and what shadow of *prevarication* is here? May I not still declare the *plain, old religion* of the Church of England, and yet very consistently aver, that *right opinion* is a very slender part of it?

4. The next passage, I am sorry to say, is neither related with seriousness nor truth. "We have seen him inviting persecution." Never: though I "rejoiced" in the instance alleged, at having an opportunity of calling a multitude of the most abandoned sinners to repentance. What is peculiarly unfair is, the lame, false account is palmed upon me, by "so he himself tells the story." I must therefore tell the story once more, in as few words as I can.

Sunday, Aug. 7, 1737, I repelled Mrs. W from the communion. Tuesday 9, I was required by Mr. Bailiff Parker to appear at the next court. Thursday 11, Mr. Causton, her uncle, said to me, "Give your reasons for repelling her before the whole congregation." I answered, 'Sir, if you insist upon it, I will.' But I heard no more of it. Afterward he said (but not to *me*) "Mr. W had repelled Sophy out of revenge, because he had made proposals of marriage to her which she rejected." Tuesday 16, Mrs. W made affidavit of it. Thursday, Sept. 1, a Grand Jury, prepared by Mr. Causton, found, that "John Wesley had broken the laws of the realm, by speaking and writing to Mrs. W against her husband's consent, and by repelling her from the communion."

Friday 2, was the third court day at which I appeared since my being required so to do by Mr. Parker. I moved for an immediate hearing; but was put off till the next court day. On the next court day I appeared again, as also at the two courts following; but could not be heard. Thursday, Nov. 3, I appeared in court again; and yet again on Tuesday, Nov. 22, on which day Mr. C. desired to speak with me, and read me an affidavit, in which it was affirmed, that I "abused Mr. C. in his own house, calling him liar, villain, and so on." It was likewise repeated, that I had been reprimanded at the last court, by Mr. C. as an enemy to, and hinderer of, the public peace.

'My friends agreed with me, that the time we looked for, was now come. And the next morning, calling on Mr. C. I told him, 'I designed to set out for England immediately.'

Friday, Decem. 2, I proposed to set out for Carolina about noon. But about ten, the magistrates sent for me, and told me, "I must not go out of the province: for I had not answered the allegations laid against me." I replied, 'I had appeared at six or seven courts, in order to answer them, but I was not suffered so to do.' After a few more words, I said, 'You use me very ill. And so you do the trustees. You know your business and I know mine.' In the afternoon, they published an order, forbidding any to assist me in going out of the province. But I knew, I had no more business there. So as evening prayer was over, the tide then serving, I took boat at the Bluff for Carolina.'

This is the plain account of the matter. I need only add a remark or two on the pleasantries of my censurer. "He had recourse as usual, to his revelations. I consulted my friends, whether God did not call me to England." (p. 242.) Not by revelations: these were out of the question; but by clear, strong reasons. "The

magistrate soon quickened his pace, by declaring him an enemy to the public peace." No ; that senseless assertion of Mr. C. made me go neither sooner or later. "The reader has seen him long languish for persecution." What, before November, 1737? I never *languished* for it either before or since. But I *submit* to what pleases God. "To hide his poltronery in a bravado, he gave public notice of his apostolical intention." (p. 243.) Kind and civil ! I may be excused from taking notice of what follows. It is equally serious and genteel.

"Had his longings for persecution been without hypocrisy." The same mistake throughout. I never longed or *professed* to long for it at all. But if I had *professed* it ever *since* I returned from Georgia, what was done *before* I returned could not prove *that profession* to be *hypocrisy*. So all this ribaldry serves no end ; only to throw *much dirt*, if haply some may stick.

Meantime, how many untruths are here in one page ! 1. "He made the path doubly perplexed for his followers. 2. He left them to answer for his crimes. 3. He longed for persecution. 4. He went as far as Georgia for it. 5. The truth of his mission was questioned by the magistrate, and, 6. Decried by the people. 7. For his false morals. 8. The gospel was wounded through the sides of its pretended missionary. 9. The first Christian preachers offered up themselves :" (so did I.) "Instead of this, our paltry mimic." (p. 244.) *Bona verba* ! Surely a writer should *reverence himself*, how much soever he *despises* his opponent. So upon the whole, this proof of my *hypocrisy* is as lame as the three former.

5. "We have seen above, how he sets all prudence at defiance." None but *false prudence*. "But he uses a different language when his rivals are to be restrained." No : always the same, both with regard to *false prudence* and *true*.

"But take the affair from the beginning. He began to suspect rivals in the year thirty-nine : for he says, 'Remembering how many that came after me were preferred before me.'" The very next words show in what sense. They *had attained unto the law of righteousness* : I had not. But what has this to do with *rivals* ?

However, go on. "At this time (Dec. 8, 1739,) his opening the Bible afforded him but small relief. He sunk so far in his despondency, as to doubt if God would not lay him aside, and send other labourers into his harvest." But this was *another time*. It was June 22. And the occasion of the doubt is expressly mentioned. 'I preached, but had no life or spirit in me, and was much in doubt,' on that account. Not on account of Mr. Whitefield. He did not 'now begin to set up for himself.' We were in full union ; nor was there the least shadow of *rivalry* or contention between us. I still sincerely "praise God for his wisdom, in giving different talents to different preachers," (p. 250,) and particularly for his giving Mr. Wh. the talents which I have not.

6. What farther proof of hypocrisy ? Why, "he had given innu-

merable flirts of contempt in his Journals against human learning." (p. 252, 253.) Where? I do not know. Let the passages be cited: else let me speak *for it* ever so much, it will prove nothing. "At last he was forced to have recourse to what he had so much scorned, I mean, prudence." (p. 255.) All a mistake. I hope never to have recourse to *false prudence*; and *true prudence* I never scorned.

"He might have met Mr. Wh. half way: but he was too formidable a rival. With a less formidable one he pursues this way. I laboured, says he, to convince Mr. Gr." (my assistant, not *rival*) "that he had not done well, in confuting, as he termed it, the sermon I preached the Sunday before. I asked, will you meet me half way? (the words following put my meaning beyond all dispute.) I will never publicly preach against you. Will not you against me? Here we see a fair invitation to Mr. Gr. to play the hypocrite with him." Not in the least. Each might simply deliver his own sentiments, without preaching against the other. "We conclude that Mr. Wesley, amidst his warmest exclamations against all prudence, had still a succedaneum, which he indeed calls prudence: But its true name is craft." p. 257.

Craft is an essential part of *worldly prudence*. This I detest and abhor. And let him prove it upon me that can. But it must be by better arguments than the foregoing. Truly Christian prudence, such as was recommended by our Lord, and practised by him and his apostles, I reverence and desire to learn, being convinced of its abundant usefulness.

I know nothing material in the argument which I have left untouched. And I must now refer it to all the world, whether, for all that has been brought to the contrary, I may not still have a measure of the 'wisdom from above, which is first pure, then peaceable; gentle, easy to be entreated; full of mercy and good fruits; without partiality and without hypocrisy.'

I have spoken abundantly more concerning myself than I intended or expected. Yet I must beg leave to add a few words more. How far I am from being an enemy to *prudence*, I hope appears already. It remains to inquire, whether I am an enemy to *reason* or *natural religion*?

"As to the first, he frankly tells us, The father of lies was the father of reasonings also. For he says, I observed more and more the advantage Satan had gained over us. Many were thrown into idle reasonings." (p. 298.) Yes, and they were hurt thereby. But *reason* is good, though *idle reasonings* are evil. Nor does it follow, that I am an enemy to the one, because I condemn the other.

"However, you are an enemy to natural religion. For you say, A Frenchman gave us a full account of the Chicasaws. They do nothing but eat, and drink, and smoke, from morning till night, and almost from night till morning. For they arise at any hour of the night when they awake, and after eating and drinking as much as they can, go to sleep again. Hence we could not but remark, what

is the religion of nature, properly so called, or that religion which flows from natural reason, unassisted by revelation." (p. 290.) I believe this dispute may be cut short by only defining the term. What does your lordship mean by *natural religion*? A *system of principles*? But I mean by it, in this place, *men's natural manners*. These certainly "flow from their natural passions and appetites," with that degree of reason which they have. And this, in other instances, is not contemptible; though it is not sufficient to teach them true religion.

II. I proceed to consider, in the second place, what is advanced concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit.

"Our blessed Redeemer promised to send among his followers the Holy Ghost, called 'the Spirit of Truth and the Comforter,' which should co-operate with man, in establishing his faith, and in perfecting his obedience; or in other words, should sanctify him to redemption." p. 2.

Accordingly, "the sanctification and redemption of the world, man cannot frustrate nor render ineffectual. For it is not in his power to make that to be undone, which is once done and perfected." p. 337.

I do not comprehend. Is all the world sanctified? Is not to be sanctified the same as to be made holy? Is all the world holy? And "can no man frustrate" his own sanctification?

"The Holy Ghost establishes our faith, and perfects our obedience, by enlightening the understanding, and rectifying the will." p. 3.

"In the former respect, 1. He gave the gift of tongues at the day of Pentecost."

"Indeed enthusiasts in their ecstacies have talked very fluently in languages they had a very imperfect knowledge of in their sober intervals." I can no more believe this on the credit of Lord Shaftesbury and a Popish exorcist, than I can believe the tale of 'a hundred people talking without tongues,' on the credit of Dr. Middleton.

"The other gifts of the Spirit St. Paul reckons up thus. 'To one is given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another the gifts of healing, to another working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discerning of spirits.' " (p. 23.) But why are the other three left out? 'Faith, divers kinds of tongues,' and the 'interpretation of tongues'?

I believe the 'word of wisdom' means, light to explain the manifold wisdom of God in the grand scheme of gospel salvation; the 'word of knowledge,' a power of explaining the Old Testament types and prophecies. 'Faith,' may mean, an extraordinary trust in God, under the most difficult and dangerous circumstances: 'The gifts of healing,' a miraculous power of curing diseases: 'the discerning of spirits,' a supernatural discernment, whether men were upright or not? Whether they were qualified for offices in the church? And whether they who professed to speak by inspiration, really did so or not?

But "the richest of the fruits of the Spirit is the 'inspiration of

Scripture.' (p. 30.) Herein the promise, that 'the Comforter' should 'abide with us for ever,' is eminently fulfilled. For though his ordinary influence occasionally assists the faithful of all ages, yet his constant abode and supreme illumination is in the Scriptures of the New Testament. (p. 39.) I mean, he is there only as the illuminator of the understanding."

But does this agree with the following words? "Nature is not able to keep a mean. But grace is able: for 'the Spirit helpeth our infirmities.' We must apply to the 'guide of truth,' to prevent our being 'carried about with divers and strange doctrines.'" (p. 340.) Is he not then every where to illuminate the understanding, as well as to rectify the will? And, indeed, do we not need the one as continually as the other?

"But how did he inspire the Scripture? He so directed the writers, that no considerable error should fall from them." (p. 45.) Nay, will not the allowing, there is any error in Scripture, shake the authority of the whole?

Again, what is the difference between the immediate and the virtual influence of the Holy Spirit? I know Milton speaks of 'virtual or immediate touch.' But most incline to think, virtual touch is no touch at all.

"Were the style of the New Testament utterly rude and barbarous, and abounding with every fault that can possibly deform a language: this is so far from proving such language not divinely inspired, that it is one certain mark of this original." (p. 55.) A vehement paradox this. But it is not proved yet, and probably never will.

"The labours of those who have attempted to defend the purity of Scripture-Greek, have been very idly employed." (p. 66.) Others think, they have been very wisely employed, and that they have abundantly proved their point.

Having now "considered the operations of the Holy Spirit, as the guide of truth, who clears and enlightens the understanding, I proceed to consider him as the Comforter, who purifies and supports the will. (p. 89.) Sacred antiquity is full in its accounts of the sudden and entire change made by the Holy Spirit in the disposition and manners of those whom it had enlightened; instantaneously effacing their evil habits, and familiarizing them to the performance of every good action. (p. 90.) No natural cause could effect this. Neither fanaticism nor superstition, nor both of them, will account for so sudden and lasting a conversion. Superstition never effects any considerable change in the manners. Its utmost force is just enough to make us exact in the ceremonious offices of religion, or to cause some acts of penitence, as death approaches. (p. 90.) Fanaticism, indeed, acts with greater violence, and by influencing the will, frequently forces the manners from their bent, and sometimes effaces the strongest impressions of custom and nature. But this fervour, though violent, is rarely lasting; never so long as to establish the new system into a habit. So that when its rage subsides, as it very

soon does, (but where it drives into downright madness) the bias on the will keeps abating, till all the former habitudes recover their relaxed tone." p. 92.

Never were reflections more just than these. And whoever applies them to the masters of fact, which daily occur all over England, and particularly in London, will easily discern that the changes now wrought, cannot be accounted for by natural causes; not by superstition; for the manners are changed; the whole life and conversation: not by fanaticism; for these changes are so "lasting, as to establish the new system into a habit;" not by mere reason; for they are sudden; therefore they can only be wrought by the Holy Spirit.

As to Savanarola's being a frantic, or assuming the person of a prophet, I cannot take a popish historian's word. And what a man says on the rack proves nothing: no more than his dying silent. Probably this might arise from shame and consciousness of having accused himself falsely under the torture.

"But how does the Spirit as Comforter abide with us for ever? He abides with the church for ever, as well personally in his office of comforter, as virtually in his office of enlightener." (p. 96.)

Does he not then abide with the church personally, in both these respects? What is meant by abiding virtually? And what is the difference between abiding virtually, and abiding personally?

"The question will be, Does he still exercise his office, in the same extraordinary manner as in the apostles' days." (p. 97.) I know none that affirms it. "St. Paul has determined this question. 'Charity,' says he, 'never faileth. But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail, whether there be tongues, they shall cease, whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.' 1 Cor. xiii. 8, &c."

The common opinion is, that this respects another life, as he enforces his argument by this observation, 'Now we see through a glass darkly: but then face to face. Now we know in part: but then shall we know, even as also we are known. 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

"But the apostle means, charity is to accompany the church in all its stages: whereas prophecy and all the rest are only bestowed during its infant-state, to support it against the delusions and powers of darkness." p. 100.

"The Corinthians abounded in these gifts, but were wanting in charity. And this the apostle here exposes by proving charity to be superior to them all, both in qualities and duration. The three first verses declare that the other gifts are useless without charity. The next four specify the qualities of charity; the remaining six declare its continuance. (p. 102.) 'Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail, whether there be tongues, they shall cease, whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.' In the next verse he gives the reason. 'For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away:' i.e. when that Christian life,

the lines of which are marked out by the gospel, shall arrive to its full vigour and maturity; then the temporary aids, given to subdue prejudice, and to support the weak, shall like scaffolding, be removed." In other words, "when that Christian life, wherein the apostles and first Christians were but infants, shall arrive to its full vigour and maturity in their successors, then miracles shall cease." But I fear that time is not yet come. I doubt none that are now alive, enjoy more of the vigour and maturity of the Christian life, than the very first Christians did.

"To show that the loss of these will not be regretted, when the church has advanced from a state of infancy to manhood," (alas the day! Were the apostles but infants to us?) "he illustrates the case by an elegant similitude. 'When I was a child I spake as a child—but when I became a man, I put away childish things.' His next remark, concerning the defects of human knowledge, is only an occasional answer to an objection. And the last verse shows, that the superior duration of charity refers to the present life only. 'Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.' That is, you may perhaps object, faith and hope will likewise remain in the church, when prophecy, tongues, and knowledge are ceased; they will so; but still charity is the greatest, because of its excellent qualities." p. 107.

"The last verse shows!" Is not this begging the question? How forced is all this? The plain natural meaning of the passage is, love, (the absolute necessity, and the nature of which is shown in the foregoing verses,) has another commendation, it never faileth; it accompanies and adorns us to eternity. 'But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail, when all things are fulfilled, and God is all in all: 'whether there be tongues, they shall cease.' One language shall prevail among all the inhabitants of heaven, while the low, imperfect languages of earth are forgotten. The knowledge, likewise we now so eagerly pursue, shall then vanish away. As star-light is lost in that of the midday sun, so our present knowledge in the light of eternity. 'For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.' We have here but short, narrow, imperfect conceptions, even of the things round about us, and much more of the deep things of God. And even the prophecies which men deliver from God, are far from taking in the whole of future events. 'But when that which is perfect is come,' at death, and in the last day, 'that which is in part shall be done away.' Both that low, imperfect, glimmering light, which is all the knowledge we can now attain to: and these slow and unsatisfactory methods of attaining, as well as of imparting it to others. 'When I was a child, I talked as a child, I understood as a child, I reasoned as a child.' As if he had said, In our present state, we are mere infants, compared to what we shall be hereafter: 'but when I became a man, I put away childish things:' and a proportionable change shall we all find, when we launch into eternity. 'Now we see,' even the things which surround us, 'by means of a glass,' or 'mirror,' in a dim, faint, ob-

ture manner, so that every thing is a kind of riddle to us : but then we 'shall see,' not a faint reflection, but the objects themselves, face to face,' directly and distinctly. 'Now I know but in part.' Even when God reveals things to me, great part of them is still kept under the veil : 'but then shall I know, even as I also am known :' in a clear, full, comprehensive manner, in some measure like God, who penetrates the centre of every object, and sees at one glance through my soul and all things. 'And now,' during the present life, 'abide these three, faith, hope, love: but the greatest of these,' in its duration, as well as the excellence of its nature, 'is love.' Faith, hope, love, are the sum of perfection on earth : love alone is the sum of perfection in heaven.

"It appears then, that the miraculous powers of the church, were to cease upon its perfect establishment." (p. 107.) Nothing like it appears from this scripture. But supposing it did, is Christianity perfectly established yet ? Even nominal Christianity ? Mr. Brerewood took large pains to be fully informed. And, according to his account, five parts in six of the known world, are Mahometans or Pagans to this day. If so, Christianity is yet far from being perfectly established, either in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America.

"Having now established the fact," (wonderfully established !) "we may inquire into the fitness of it. There were two causes of the extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, one to manifest his mission, (and this was done once for all) the other to comfort and instruct the church." p. 110.

"At his first descent on the apostles, he found their minds rude and uninformed, strangers to all heavenly knowledge, and utterly averse to the gospel. He illuminated their minds with all necessary truth. For a rule of faith not being yet composed," (No ! had they not 'the law and the prophets ?) "some extraordinary infusion of his virtue was still necessary. But when this rule was perfected, part of this office was transferred upon the sacred canon ; and his enlightening grace was not to be expected in such abundant measure, as to make the recipients infallible guides." (p. 112.) Certainly it was not. If this be all that is intended, no one will gainsay.

"Yet modern fanatics pretend to as high a degree of divine communications, as if no such rule were in being :" (I do not :) "or at least, as if that rule, needed the further assistance of the Holy Spirit to explain his own meaning." This is quite another thing. I do firmly believe, (and what serious man does not ?) *Omnis scriptura legi debet eo Spiritu quo scripta est* : we need the same Spirit to understand the Scripture, which enabled the holy men of old to write it.

"Again, the whole strength of human prejudices was then set in opposition to the gospel, to overcome the obstinacy and violence of which, nothing less than the power of the Holy one was sufficient. (p. 113.) At present, whatever prejudices may remain, it draws the other way." What, toward holiness ? Toward temperance and chastity ? Toward justice, mercy, and truth ? Quite the reverse.

And to overcome the obstinacy and violence of the heart-prejudices which still lie against these, the power of the Holy One is as necessary now, as ever it was from the beginning of the world.

“A further reason for the ceasing of miracles is, the peace and security of the church. The profession of the Christian faith is now attended with ease and honour.” “The profession:” true: but not the thing itself: as ‘all that will live godly in Christ Jesus’ experience.

“But if miracles are not ceased, why do you not prove your mission thereby?” As your Lordship has frequently spoken to this effect, I will now give a clear answer.—And I purposely do it, in the same words which I published many years since.

1. I have in some measure explained myself on the head of miracles, in the third part of the Farther Appeal. But since you repeat the demand, (though without taking any notice of the arguments there advanced,) I will endeavour once more to give you a distinct, full, and determinate answer. And, 1. I acknowledge that I have seen with my eyes, and heard with my ears, several things, which, to the best of my judgment, cannot be accounted for by the ordinary course of natural causes, and which, I therefore believe, ought to be ascribed to the extraordinary interposition of God. If any man choose to style these miracles, I reclaim not. I have weighed the preceding and following circumstances. I have strove to account for them in a natural way: but could not, without doing violence to my reason. Not to go far back, I am clearly persuaded, that the sudden deliverance of John Haydon was one instance of this kind, and my own recovery on May the 10th, another. I cannot account for either of these in a natural way. Therefore I believe they were both supernatural.

I must, secondly, observe, that the truth of these facts is supported by the same kind of proof as that of all other facts is wont to be, namely, the testimony of competent witnesses. And that the testimony here is in as high a degree as any reasonable man can desire. Those witnesses were many in number: they could not be deceived themselves; for the fact in question they saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears. Nor is it credible, that so many of them would combine together with a view of deceiving others; the greater part being men who feared God, as appeared by the general tenor of their lives. Thus, in the case of John Haydon. This thing was not contrived and executed in a corner, and in the presence of his own family only, or three or four persons prepared for the purpose. No: it was in an open street in the city of Bristol, at one or two in the afternoon. And the doors being open from the beginning, not only many of the neighbours, from every side, but several others (indeed whosoever desired it,) went in till the house could contain no more. Nor yet does the account of my own illness and recovery depend, as you suppose, on my bare word. There were many witnesses, both of my disorder, on Friday and Saturday, and my lying down most part of Sunday, (a thing they were well

satisfied could not be the effect of a slight indisposition,) and all who saw me that evening, plainly discerned (what I could not wholly conceal) that I was in pain: about two hundred of whom were present, when I was seized with the cough, which cut me short, so that I could speak no more; till I cried aloud, 'Lord, increase my faith: Lord, confirm the word of thy grace.' The same persons saw and heard, that at the instant I changed my posture, and broke out into thanksgiving: that quickly after I stood upright, (which I could not before) and showed no sign either of sickness or pain.

Yet I must desire you well to observe, thirdly, that my will, or choice, or desire, had no place either in this or any case of this kind, that has ever fallen under my notice. Five minutes before, I had no thought of this. I expected nothing less. I was willing to wait for a gradual recovery in the ordinary use of outward means. I did not look for any other cure, till the moment before I found it. And it is my belief, that the case was always the same with regard to the most real and undoubted miracles. I believe God never interposed his miraculous power but according to his own sovereign Will: not according to the will of man: neither of him by whom he wrought, nor of any other man whatsoever. The wisdom as well as the power is his; nor can I find that ever, from the beginning of the world, he lodged this power in any mere man, to be used whenever that man saw good. Suppose, therefore, there was a man now upon earth, who did work "real and undoubted miracles;" I would ask, by whose power doth he work these? And at whose pleasure? His own, or God's? Not his own, but God's. But if so, then your demand is made not on man, but on God. I cannot say it is modest thus to challenge God; or well-suiting the relation of a creature to his Creator.

2. However, I cannot but think, there have been already so many interpositions of divine power, as will shortly leave you without excuse, if you either deny or despise them. We desire no favour; but the justice that diligent inquiry may be made concerning them. We are ready to name the persons on whom the power was shown which belongeth to none but God; (not one, or two, or ten, or twelve only;) to point out their places of abode: and we engage they shall answer every pertinent question fairly and directly; and, if required, shall give all their answers upon oath, before any who are empowered to receive them. It is our particular request, that the circumstances which went before, which accompanied, and which followed after the facts under consideration, may be thoroughly examined, and punctually noted down. Let but this be done, (and is it not highly needful it should?) At least by those who would form an exact judgment?) and we have no fear, that any reasonable man should scruple to say, 'This hath God wrought.'

As there have been already so many instances of this kind far beyond what we dared to ask or think, I cannot take upon me to say, whether or not it will please God to add to their number. I have not herein 'known the mind of the Lord,' neither am I 'his

counsellor.' He may, or he may not: I cannot affirm or deny. I have no light, and I have no desire either way. 'It is the Lord: let him do what seemeth him good.' I desire only to be as clay in his hand.

3. "But what if there were now to be wrought ever so many real and undoubted miracles?" (I suppose you mean by undoubted, such as being sufficiently attested, ought not to be doubted of.) "Why, this, you say, would put the controversy on a short foot, and be an effectual proof of the truth of your pretences." By no means. As common as this assertion is, there is none upon earth more false. Suppose a teacher was now, on this very day, to work real and undoubted miracles, this would extremely little shorten the controversy between him and the greatest part of his opposers: for all this would not force them to believe; but many would still stand just where they did before: seeing men may 'harden their hearts' against miracles as well as against arguments.

So men have done from the beginning of the world, even against such signal, glorious miracles, against such interpositions of the power of God, as may not be again till the consummation of all things. Permit me to remind you only of a few instances: and to observe, that the argument holds *a fortiori*; for who will ever be empowered of God again to work such miracles as these were? Did Pharaoh look on all that Moses and Aaron wrought as an "effectual proof of the truth of their pretences?" Even when the Lord 'made the sea to be dry land, and the waters were divided:' when the children of Israel 'went into the midst of the sea,' and the waters 'were a wall on the right and on the left?' Exod. xiv. 21, 22. Nay:

The wounded dragon rag'd in vain;
And fierce, the utmost plagues to brave,
Madly he dar'd the parting main,
And sunk beneath the o'erwhelming wave.

Was all this an "effectual proof of the truth of their pretences," to the Israelites themselves? It was not: 'they were' still 'disobedient at the sea, even at the Red Sea.' Was the giving them day by day 'bread from heaven,' "an effectual proof" to those 'two hundred and fifty of the princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown,' who said with Dathan and Abiram, 'Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men? We will not come up.' Numb. xvi. 14. Nay, 'when the ground clave asunder that was under them, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up!' (v. 32.) Neither was this an "effectual proof" to those who saw it with their eyes, and heard the cries of those who went down into the pit: but the very next day, they "murmured against Moses, and against Aaron, saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord." (v. 41.) Was not the case generally the same with regard to the prophets that followed? Several of whom 'stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire,' and did many other mighty works: yet their own people received them not. Yet 'they were

stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were slain with the sword ; they were destitute, afflicted, tormented ! Utterly contrary to the commonly received supposition, “ That the working real, undoubted miracles, must bring all controversy to an end, and convince every gainsayer.”

Let us come nearer yet. How stood the case between our Lord himself and his opposers ? Did he not work real and undoubted miracles ? And what was the effect ? Still when ‘ he came to his own, his own received him not.’ Still ‘ he was despised and rejected of men.’ Still it was a challenge not to be answered, ‘ Have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees, believed on him ?’ After this, how can you imagine, that whoever works miracles must convince all men of “ the truth of his pretences ?”

I would just remind you of only one instance more. ‘ There sat a certain man at Lystra, impotent in his feet, being a cripple from his mother’s womb, who had never walked. The same heard Paul speak ; who steadfastly beholding him, and perceiving he had faith to be healed, said, with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked.’—Here was so undoubted a miracle, that the people ‘ lift up their voices, saying, The gods are come down in the likeness of men.’ But how long were even these convinced of “ the truth of his pretences ?” Only till ‘ there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium ;’ and then they ‘stoned him’ (as they supposed) to death ! Acts xiv. 1, &c. So certain it is, that no miracles whatever, that were ever yet wrought in the world, were effectual to prove the most glaring truth to those who hardened their hearts against it.

4. And it will equally hold in every age and nation. ‘ If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be’ convinced (of what they desire not to believe) ‘ though one rose from the dead.’ Without a miracle, without one rising from the dead, *εάν τις θεληπολειν*, ‘ if any man be willing to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.’ But if he is not ‘ willing to do his will,’ he will never want an excuse, a plausible reason for rejecting it : yea, though ever so many miracles were wrought to confirm it. For let ‘ ever so much light come into the world,’ it will have no effect, (such is the wise and just will of God,) on those who ‘ love darkness rather than light.’—It will not convince those who do not simply desire to do ‘ the will of their Father which is in heaven.’ Those ‘ who mind earthly things,’ who (if they do not continue in any gross outward sin, yet) love pleasure and ease ; yet seek profit or power, preferment, or reputation. Nothing will ever be an effectual proof to these; of the holy and acceptable will of God, unless first their proud hearts be humbled, their stubborn wills bowed down, and their desires brought, at least, in some degree, into obedience to the law of Christ.

Hence, although it should please God to work anew all the wonders that ever were wrought on earth, still these men, however wise and prudent they may be in things relating to the present world,

would fight against God and all his messengers, and that in spite of these miracles. Meanwhile God will reveal his truth ‘unto babes,’ unto those who are meek and lowly, whose desires are in heaven, who want to ‘know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified.’— These need no outward miracles to show them his will; they have a plain rule, the written word. And ‘the anointing which they have received of him, abideth in them, and teacheth them all things.’ (1 John ii. 27.) Through this they are enabled to bring all doctrines ‘to the law and the testimony.’ And whatsoever is agreeable to this they receive, without waiting to see it attested by miracles. As, on the other hand, whatsoever is contrary to this they reject; nor can any miracles move them to receive it.

5. Yet I do not know, that God hath any where precluded himself from thus exerting his sovereign power, from working miracles, in any kind or degree, in any age, to the end of the world. I do not recollect any scripture wherein we are taught that miracles were to be confined within the limits either of the Apostolic or the Cyprianic age, or of any period of time, longer or shorter, even till the restitution of all things. I have not observed, either in the Old Testament or the New, any intimation at all of this kind. St. Paul indeed says once, concerning two of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, (so I think that text is usually understood,) ‘whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease;’ but he does not say, either that these or any other miracles shall cease, till faith and hope shall cease also; till they shall all be swallowed up in the vision of God, and love be all in all.

I presume you will allow, there is one kind of miracles (loosely speaking) which are not ceased: namely, *τερατα φενδεις, lying wonders,* diabolical miracles, wrought by the power of evil spirits. Nor can you easily conceive, that these will cease, as long as the ‘father of lies’ is the ‘prince of this world.’ And why should you think, that the God of Truth is less active than he, or that he will not have his miracles also? Only not as man wills, neither when he wills; but according to his own excellent wisdom and goodness.

6. But even if it were supposed, that God does now work beyond the operation of merely natural causes, yet what impression would this make upon *you*, in the disposition of mind you are now in? Suppose the trial was repeated, and made again to-morrow. One informs you the next day, “While a clergyman was preaching yesterday, where I was, a man came who had been long ill of an incurable distemper. Prayer was made for him. And he was restored to perfect health.”

Suppose now that this was a real fact, perhaps you would scarce have patience to hear the account of it: but would cut it short in the midst, with ‘Do you tell this as something supernatural? Then miracles are not ceased.’ But if you should venture to ask, Where was this? And who was the person that prayed? And it was answered, “At the Foundry near Moorfields; the person who prayed was Mr. Wesley.” What a damp comes at once! What a weight

falls on your mind at the first setting out ! It is well if you have any heart or desire to move one step farther. Or if you should, what a strong additional propensity do you now feel to deny the fact ? And is there not a ready excuse for so doing ? " O ! they who tell the story are his own people ; most of whom we may be sure, will say any thing for him, and the rest will believe any thing."—But if you at length allowed the fact, might you not find means to account for it by natural causes ? " Great crowds, violent heats, with obstructions and irregularities of the blood and spirits," will do wonders.—If you could not but allow it was more than natural, might not some plausible reason be found, for ranking it among the lying wonders, for ascribing it to the Devil rather than God ? And if, after all, you were convinced it was the finger of God, must you not still bring every doctrine advanced 'to the law and the testimony,' the only sure and infallible test of all ?—What then is the use of this continual demand, " Show us a sign, and we will believe ?" What will you believe ? I hope no more than is written in the Book of God. And thus far you might venture to believe, even without a miracle.

7. Let us consider this point a little farther. " What is it you would have us prove by miracles ? The doctrines we preach ?" We prove these by Scripture and reason ; and if need be by antiquity. What else is it then we are to prove by miracles ? At length we have a distinct reply. " Wise and sober men will not otherwise be convinced" (i. e. unless you prove it by miracles) " that God is, by the means of such teachers and such doctrines, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth." So then the determinate point which you, in their name, call upon us to prove by miracles, is this : " That God is by these teachers, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth."—What I mean by a great and extraordinary work, is the bringing multitudes of gross, notorious sinners, in a short space, to the fear, and love, and service of God, to an entire change of heart and life.

Now, then, let us take a nearer view of the proposition, and see which part of it we are to prove by miracles.

Is it, 1. That A. B. was for many years without God in the world, a common swearer, a drunkard, or sabbath breaker ?

Or, 2. That he is not so now ?

Or, 3. That he continued so till he heard this man preach, and from that time was another man ?

Not so. The proper way to prove these facts, is by the testimony of competent witnesses. And these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them.

Or, would you have us prove by miracles,

4. That this was not done by our own power or holiness ?—That God only is able to raise the dead, to quicken those who are dead in trespasses and sins ?

Where then is the wisdom of those men who demanded miracles in proof of such a proposition ? One branch of which, " That such sinners are reformed by means of these teachers," being a plain fact,

can only be proved by testimony, as all other facts are ; and the other, “ That this is *a work of God, and a more than ordinary work*,” needs no proof, as carrying its own evidence to every thinking man.

8. To sum up this. No truly *wise* or *sober* man can possibly desire or expect miracles, to prove, either, 1. That these *doctrines* are true : this must be decided by Scripture and reason ; or, 2. That these *facts* are true : this can only be proved by testimony : or, 3, That to *change* sinners from darkness to light, is the *work of God* alone ; only using what instruments he pleases : this is glaringly self-evident : or, 4. That *such a change* wrought in *so many notorious* sinners, within *so short* a time is a *great* and *extraordinary* work of God. What then is it remains to be proved by miracles ? Perhaps you will say, it is this, “ That God has *called*, or *sent* you to do this.” Nay, this is implied in the third of the foregoing propositions. If God has actually *used* us therein, if *his work* hath in fact prospered in our hands, then he hath *called* or *sent* us to do this. I entreat reasonable men to weigh this thoroughly, whether the *fact* does not plainly prove the *call*. Whether he who thus *enables* us to save souls alive, does not *commission* us so to do ? Whether by giving us the *power* to pluck these brands out of the burning, he does not *authorize* us to exert it ? O that it were possible for you to consider calmly, whether the *success* of the gospel of Jesus Christ, even as it is preached by us, the least of his servants, be not itself a *miracle*, never to be forgotten ! One which cannot be denied, as being visible at this day, not in one, but a hundred places : one which cannot be accounted for by the *ordinary* course of any *natural causes* whatsoever : one which cannot be ascribed, with any colour of reason, to diabolical agency : and, lastly, one which will bear the infallible test, the trial of the written word.*

But “why do you talk of the *success of the gospel* in England, which was a Christian country before you were born ?” Was it indeed ? Is it so at this day ? I would explain myself a little on this head also.

And, 1. None can deny that the people of England, in general, are *called* Christians. They are *called* so, a few only excepted, by others, as well as themselves. But I presume no man will say the *name* makes the thing ; that men *are* Christians, barely because they are *called* so. It must be allowed, 2. That the people of England, generally speaking, have been *christened*, or *baptized* ; but neither can we infer, “ These were *once* *baptized* ; therefore they are Christians now.” It is, 3. Allowed, That many of those who were once *baptized*, and are *called* Christians to this day, *hear* the word of God, attend *public prayers*, and partake of the *Lord's Supper*. But neither does this prove, that they *are* Christians. For notwithstanding this, some of them live in open sin : and others (though not conscious to themselves of *hypocrisy*, yet) are utter strangers to the *religion of the heart* : are full of pride, vanity, covetousness, ambi-

* Second Letter to Dr. Church.

tion ; of hatred, anger, malice, or envy ; and consequently, are no more *spiritual Christians* than the open drunkard, or common swearer.

Now these being removed, where are the *Christians*, from whom we may properly term England a *Christian country* ? The men who have *the mind which was in Christ*, and who *walk as he also walked* ? Whose inmost soul is renewed after the image of God ; and who are outwardly holy, as he who hath called them is holy ? There are doubtless a few such to be found. To deny this, would be “want of candour.” But how few ! How thinly scattered up and down ! And as for a *Christian visible church*, or a body of *Christians*, visibly united together, where is this to be seen ?

Ye different sects, who all declare,
Lo ! here is Christ, or Christ is there,
Your stronger proofs divinely give,
And show me where the *Christians* live !

And what use is it of, what good end does it serve, to term England a *Christian country* ? Although, it is true, most of the natives are *called Christians*, have been *baptized*, frequent the *ordinances* : and although here and there, a real *Christian* is to be found, *as a light shining in a dark place*. Does it do any honour to our great Master, among those who are not *called* by his name ? Does it recommend Christianity to the *Jews*, the *Mahometans*, or the avowed *Heathens* ? Surely no one can conceive it does. It only makes *Christianity* stink in their nostrils. Does it answer any *good end*, with regard to those who are *called* by this worthy name ? I fear not ; but rather an exceedingly bad one. For does it not keep multitudes easy in their *heathen* practices ? Does it not make or keep still greater numbers satisfied with their *heathen tempers* ? Does it not directly tend to make both the one and the other imagine, that they *are* what indeed they *are not* ? That they *are Christians*, while they are utterly without Christ, and without God in the world ? To close this point. If men are not *Christians*, till they are renewed after the image of Christ, and if the *people of England*, in general, are not thus renewed, why do we term them so ? ‘The god of this world hath long blinded their hearts.’ Let us do nothing to increase that blindness : but rather to recover them from that ‘strong delusion,’ that they may no longer believe a lie.’

Let us labour to convince all mankind, that to be *real Christians* is, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and to serve him with all our strength ; to love our neighbour as ourselves, and therefore to do unto every man, as we would they should do unto us.*

To change one of these *Heathens* into a *real Christian*, and to continue him such, all the *ordinary operations* of the Holy Spirit are absolutely necessary. “But what are they ?” I sum them up, (as I did in the *Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*) in the words of as learned and orthodox a divine as ever England bred.

* Second Letter to Dr. Church.

‘Sanctification being opposed to our corruption, and answering fully to the latitude thereof, whatsoever holiness and perfection are wanting in our nature, must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore, we being by nature totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God: this ‘Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God,’ and *revealeth* them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of God. The same Spirit which *revealeth* the object of faith, generally, to the universal church, doth also *illuminate the understanding* of such as believe; that they may receive the truth. For ‘faith is the gift of God,’ not only in the object, but also in the act. And this gift, is the gift of the Holy Ghost working within us. And as the increase of perfection, so the original of faith is from the Spirit of God, by internal illumination of the soul.’

‘The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man, in all the parts and faculties of his soul. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversion of our wills, and a deputation of our affections; an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God.

‘The third part of his office is, to lead, direct, and govern us, in our actions and conversations. ‘If we live in the Spirit,’ quickened by his renovation, we must also ‘walk in the Spirit,’ following his direction, led by his manuduction. We are also animated and acted by the Spirit of God, who giveth ‘both to will and to do.’

“And ‘as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God.’ (Rom. viii. 14.) Moreover that this direction may prove more effectual, we are guided in our prayers by the same Spirit: according to the promise, ‘I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and supplication.’ (Zech. xii. 10.) Whereas then, ‘this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us:’ and whereas ‘we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered.’ (ver. 26, 27.) ‘And he that searcheth the heart knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.’ From which intercession (made for all true Christians) “he hath the name of the *Paraclete* given him by Christ; who said, ‘I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete.’ (John xiv. 16. 26.) For, ‘if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,’ saith St. John, 1 Epist. ii. 1: ‘who maketh intercession for us,’ saith St. Paul. Rom. viii. 34. A *Paraclete*, then, in the notion of the Scriptures, is an intercessor.”

“It is also the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons,’ to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. ‘The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts,’ by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of

God, they are the sons of God. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.* For we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, *Abba, Father:* the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.' As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also by the same Spirit *assured of our adoption.* Because, being 'sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ,' by the same Spirit we have the *pledge*, or rather the *earnest*, of our inheritance. 'For he which establisheth us in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and hath given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts;' so 'we are sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance.' The Spirit of God, as given to us in this life, is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.'

It now rests with your lordship to take your choice; either to condemn or acquit both: either your lordship must condemn bishop Pearson for an *enthusiast*, or you must acquit me: for I have his express authority on my side, concerning every text, which I affirm to belong to all Christians.

But I have greater authority than his, and such as I reverence, only less than the oracles of God. I mean, that of our own church. I shall close this head, by setting down what occurs in her authentic records, concerning either our *receiving the Holy Ghost*, or his *ordinary operations* in all true Christians.

In her daily Service, she teacheth us all to 'beseech God to grant us his Holy Spirit, that those things may please him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life may be pure and holy:' to pray for our 'sovereign Lord the king,' that God would 'replenish him with the grace of his Holy Spirit;' for all the royal family, 'that they may be endued with his Holy Spirit, and enriched with his heavenly grace;' for all the clergy and people, that he would 'send down upon them the healthful Spirit of his grace;' for the 'catholic church,' that 'it may be guided and governed by his good Spirit;' and for all therein, who, at any time, 'make their common supplications unto him,' that the 'fellowship' or communication 'of the Holy Ghost may be with them all evermore.'

Her Collects are full of petitions to the same effect. 'Grant that we may daily be renewed by the Holy Spirit.*' 'Grant that in all our sufferings here, for the testimony of thy truth, we may by faith behold the glory that shall be revealed, and being filled with the Holy Ghost, may love and bless our persecutors.'† 'Send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity.'‡ 'O Lord, from whom all good things do come, grant to us, thy hum-

* Collect for Christmas Day. † St. Stephen's Day. ‡ *Qinqueagesima Sunday.*

ble servants, that by thy holy inspiration, we may think those things that are good, and by thy merciful guidance may perform the same.*
 'We beseech thee, leave us not comfortless, but send us the Holy Ghost to comfort us.'† 'Grant us by the same Spirit, to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort.'‡
 'Grant us, Lord, we beseech thee, the Spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful.'§ 'O God, forasmuch as without thee we are not able to please thee, mercifully grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts.'|| 'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name.'¶

'Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, (or this person,) that he may be born again.'—'Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons,' (N.B. already baptiz'd,) 'that they may continue thy servants.'

'Almighty God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these persons by water and the Holy Ghost:—strengthen them with the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, and daily increase in them the manifold gifts of thy grace.'**

From these passages it may sufficiently appear for what purposes every Christian, according to the doctrine of the Church of England does now receive *the Holy Ghost*. But this will be still more clear from those that follow; wherein we may likewise observe a plain, rational sense of God's revealing himself to us, of the *inspiration* of the Holy Ghost, and of a believer's *feeling* in himself the *mighty working* of the Spirit of Christ.

'God gave them of old, grace to be his children, as he doth us now. But now by the coming of our Saviour Christ, *we have received* more abundantly *the Spirit of God* in our hearts.'†† 'He died to destroy the rule of the Devil in us, and he rose again to send down his Holy Spirit to *rule in our hearts*.' 'We have the Holy Spirit in our hearts, as a seal and pledge of our everlasting inheritance.'‡‡

'The Holy Ghost sat upon each of them, like as it had been cloven tongues of fire, to teach, that it is he that *giveth eloquence and utterance* in preaching the gospel, which engendereth a burning *zeal* towards God's word, and giveth all men *a tongue*, yea, a fiery tongue.' (N.B. Whatever occurs, in any of the Journals, of God's giving me *utterance*, or enabling me to speak *with power*, cannot therefore be quoted as *enthusiasm*, without wounding the church through my side.) 'So that if any man be a dumb Christian, not professing his faith openly, he giveth men occasion to doubt, lest he have not the grace of the Holy Ghost within him.'§§

'It is the office of the Holy Ghost to sanctify; which the more it is hid from our understanding,' (i. e. the particular manner of his working,) the more it ought to move all men to wonder at the secret

* Fifth Sunday after Easter. † Sunday after Ascension-day. ‡ Whitsunday.
 § Ninth Sunday after Trinity. || Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity. ¶ Communion office. ** Office of Confirmation. †† Hom. on Faith. ‡‡ Hom. on the Resurrection. §§ Hom. on Whitsunday, part I.

and mighty workings of God's Holy Spirit, which is within us. For it is the Holy Ghost that doth *quicken* the minds of men, *stirring up* godly motions in their hearts. Neither does he think it sufficient inwardly to work the new-birth of men, unless he does also dwell and abide in them. 'Know ye not,' saith St. Paul, 'that ye are the temples of God, and that his Spirit dwelleth in you? Know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, which is within you?' Again he saith, 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.' For why? 'The Spirit of God dwelleth in you.' To this agreeth St. John, (1. John. ii. 27,) 'The anointing which ye have received,' (he meaneth the Holy Ghost,) 'abideth in you.' And St. Peter saith the same; 'The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.' O what comfort is this to the heart of a true Christian, to think that the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him! 'If God be with us,' as the apostle saith, 'who can be against us?' He giveth patience and joyfulness of heart in temptation and affliction, and is therefore worthily called the *Comforter*. (John xiv. 16.) He doth instruct the hearts of the simple in the knowledge of God, and his word; therefore he is justly termed the *Spirit of truth*. And (N. B.) where the Holy Ghost doth instruct and teach, there is no delay at all in learning.*

[From this passage, I learn, 1. That every true Christian now receives the Holy Ghost, as the *Paraclete* or *Comforter* promised by our Lord. (John xiv. 13.) Secondly, That every Christian receives him as the *Spirit of truth*, (promised John xvi.) to teach him all things. And, 3. That the *anointing*, mentioned in the first epistle of St. John, abides in every Christian.]

'In reading of God's word, he profiteth most who is most inspired with the Holy Ghost.'†

'Human and worldly wisdom is not needful to the understanding the Scripture; but the revelation of the Holy Ghost, who inspirereth the true meaning unto them, who with humility and diligence, search for it.'‡

'Make him know and feel, that there is no other name given under heaven, unto men, whereby we can be saved. If we feel our conscience at peace with God, through remission of our sins—all is of God.'§ 'If you feel such a faith in you, rejoice in it, and let it be daily increasing by well-working.'|| 'The faithful may feel wrought, tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith and hope, with many other graces of God.'¶ 'Godly men feel inwardly God's Holy Spirit inflaming their hearts with love.'**

'God give us grace to know these things, and feel them in our hearts! This knowledge and feeling are not of ourselves. Let us, therefore, meekly call upon the bountiful Spirit, the Holy Ghost, to inspire us with his presence, that we may be able to hear the goodness of God to our salvation. For without his lively inspiration, we cannot so much as speak the name of the Mediator. 'No man can

* Hom. on Whitsunday. Part I. † Hom. on Reading the Scripture. Part I.
‡ Ibid. P. II. § Hom. on Rogation Week. P. III. || Hom. on Faith. P. III.
¶ Hom. on the Sacrament. P. I. ** Hom. on certain places of Scripture. P. I.

say, Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' Much less should we be able to believe and know these great mysteries that be opened to us by Christ. 'But we have received,' saith St. Paul, 'not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.' for this purpose, 'that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God.' In the power of the Holy Ghost resteth all ability to know God, and to please him. It is he that purifieth the mind by his secret working. He enlighteneth the heart to conceive worthy thoughts of Almighty God. He sitteth on the tongue of man, to stir him to speak his honour. He only ministereth spiritual strength to the powers of the soul and body. And if we have any gift whereby we may profit our neighbour, all is wrought by this one and self-same Spirit.*

Every proposition which I have any where advanced concerning those operations of the Holy Ghost, which I believe are common to all Christians, in all ages, is here clearly maintained by our own church.

Being fully convinced of this, I could not well understand, for many years, how it was, that on the mentioning any of these great truths, even among men of education, the cry immediately arose, "An enthusiast! an enthusiast!" But I now plainly perceive, this is only an old fallacy in a new shape. To object enthusiasm to any person or doctrine, is but a decent method of begging the question. It generally spares the objector the trouble of reasoning, and is a shorter and easier way of carrying his cause.

For instance: I assert, that "till a man receives the Holy Ghost, he is without God in the world; that he cannot know the things of God, unless God reveal them unto him by his Spirit; no, nor have even one holy or heavenly temper, without the inspiration of the Holy One." Now should one who is conscious to himself, that he has experienced none of these things, attempt to confute these propositions, either from Scripture or antiquity, it might prove a difficult task. What then shall he do? Why, cry out, "Enthusiasm! Fanaticism!" and the work is done.

"But is it not mere enthusiasm or fanaticism to talk of the New-Birth?" So one might imagine from the manner in which your lordship talks of it. "The Spirit did not stop till it had manifested itself in the last effort of his power, the New-Birth. (p. 123.) The New-Birth began in storms and tempests, in cries and ecstacies, in tumults and confusions. (p. 126.) Persons who had no sense of religion, that is, no ecstatic feelings, or pains of the New-Birth. (p. 180.) What can be the issue of the New-Birth, attended with those infernal throes? (p. 170.) Why should he elicit sense from these Gentiles, when they were finally to be deprived of it in ecstacies and New-Births? (p. 225.) All these circumstances Mr. W has declared to be constant symptoms of the New-Birth." p. 222.

So the New-Birth is, throughout the whole tract, the standing topic of ridicule !

“No, not the New-Birth itself, but your enthusiastic, ridiculous account of it.” What is then my account of the New-Birth ? I gave it some years ago, in these words :

‘It is that great change which God works in the soul, when he brings it into life : when he raises it from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. It is the change wrought in the whole soul by the Almighty Spirit of God, when it is ‘created anew in Christ Jesus,’ when it is ‘renewed after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness : when the love of the world is changed into the love of God, pride into humility, passion into meekness ; hatred, envy, malice, into a sincere, tender, disinterested love to all mankind. In a word, it is that change whereby the ‘earthly, sensual, devilish mind,’ is turned into ‘the mind which was in Christ Jesus.’’ Vol. II. of Sermons.

This is my account of the New-Birth. What is there ridiculous or enthusiastic in it ?

“But what do you mean by those tempests, and cries, and pains, and infernal throes attending the New-Birth ?” I will tell you as plainly as I can, in the very same words I used to Dr. Church, (after premising, that some experience much, some very little of these pains and throes.)

‘When men feel in themselves the heavy burthen of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell, they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call to him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathing of all worldly things and pleasures comes in place, so that nothing then liketh them more than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body, so show themselves weary of life.’

‘Now, permit me to ask, What, if before you had observed, that these were the very words of our own church, one of your acquaintance or parishioners had come and told you, that ever since he heard a sermon at the Foundry, he saw damnation before him, and beheld with the eye of his mind the horror of hell ! What if he had trembled and quaked, and been so taken up, ‘partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from the danger of hell and damnation, as to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour, to show himself weary of life ? Would you have scrupled to say, “Here is another deplorable instance of the Methodists driving men to distraction ?”*

I have now finished, as my time permits, what I had to say, either

* Second Letter to D. Church

concerning myself, or on the operations of the Holy Spirit. In doing this, I have used great plainness of speech, and yet, I hope, without rudeness. If any thing of that kind has slipped from me, I am ready to retract it. I desire, on the one hand, to 'accept no man's person,' and yet, on the other, to give 'honour to whom honour is due.'

If your lordship should think it worth your while to spend any more words upon me, may I presume to request one thing of your lordship, to be more serious? It cannot injure your lordship's character, or your cause. Truth is great, and will prevail.

Wishing your lordship all temporal and spiritual blessings, I am.

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's dutiful Son and Servant,

JOHN WESLEY

Nov. 26, 1762.



A LETTER TO A PERSON

LATELY JOINED WITH

THE PEOPLE CALLED QUAKERS,

IN ANSWER TO A LETTER WRITTEN BY HIM.



Bristol, Feb. 10, 1747-8.

YOU ask me, "Is there any difference between Quakerism and Christianity?" I think there is. What that difference is, I will tell you as plainly as I can. I will first set down the account of Quakerism (so called) which is given by Robert Barclay: and then add, wherein it agrees with, and wherein it differs from, Christianity.

I. "Seeing the height of all happiness is placed in the true knowledge of God, the right understanding of this is what is most necessary to be known in the first place.

II. "It is by the Spirit alone that the true knowledge of God hath been, is, and can be revealed. And these revelations, which are absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith, neither do nor can ever contradict right reason or the testimony of the Scriptures."

Thus far there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

"Yet these revelations are not to be subjected to the examination of the Scriptures as to a touchstone."

Here there is a difference. The Scriptures are the touchstone whereby Christians examine all (real or supposed) revelations. In all cases they appeal to the *law and to the testimony*, and *try every spirit* thereby.

III. "From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints, have proceeded the Scriptures of truth."

In this there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

"Yet the Scriptures are *not the principal ground of all truth and knowledge*, nor the adequate, primary rule of faith and manners. Nevertheless they are a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit. By him the saints are led into all truth. Therefore the Spirit is the first and principal leader."

If by these words, "The Scriptures are *not the principal ground of truth and knowledge*, nor the *adequate, primary rule of faith and manners*," be only meant, that "*the Spirit is our first and principal leader*." Here is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

But there is great impropriety of expression. For though the Spirit is our *principal leader*, yet he is not our rule at all: the Scriptures are the rule whereby he leads us into all truth. Therefore, only talk good English; call the Spirit our guide, (which signifies an intelligent being,) and the Scriptures our rule, (which signifies something used by an intelligent being,) and all is plain and clear.

IV "All mankind is fallen and dead, deprived of the sensation of this inward testimony of God, and subject to the power and nature of the Devil, while they abide in their natural state. And hence not only their words and deeds, but all their imaginations are evil perpetually in the sight of God."

V "God out of his infinite love hath so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, to the end that whosoever believeth on him, might have everlasting life. And he enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, as he tasted death for every man."

VI. "The benefit of the death of Christ is not only extended to such as have the distinct knowledge of his death and sufferings, but even unto those who are inevitably excluded from this knowledge. Even these may be partakers of the benefit of his death, though ignorant of the history, if they suffer his death to take place in their hearts, so as of wicked men to become holy"

In these points there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

VII. "As many as receive the light, in them is produced a holy and spiritual birth, bringing forth holiness, righteousness, purity, and all other blessed fruits. By which holy birth, as we are sanctified, so we are justified."

Here is a wide difference between Quakerism and Christianity. This is a flat justification by works. Whereas the Christian doctrine is, That 'we are justified by faith': that 'unto him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness.'

The ground of this mistake is, the not understanding the meaning of the word justification. For Robert Barclay takes it in the same sense as the Papists do, confounding it with sanctification. So in the 208th page of his Apology, he says, in express terms, "Justification taken in its proper signification, is, making one just, and is all one with sanctification."

VIII. "In whom this holy birth is fully brought forth, the body of sin and death is crucified, and their hearts are subjected to the truth so as not to obey any suggestion of the evil one, but to be free from actual sinning and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect, perfect."

IX. "They in whom his grace hath wrought in part to purify and sanctify them, may yet by disobedience fall from it, and make shipwreck of the faith." In these propositions there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

The uncommon expression, "This holy birth brought forth," is taken from Jacob Behmen. And indeed so are many other expressions used by the Quakers, as are also many of their sentiments.

X. "By this light of God in the heart, every true minister is ordained, prepared, and supplied in the work of the ministry."

As to part of this proposition, there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity. Doubtless "every true minister is by the light of God prepared and supplied in the work of the ministry." But the Apostles themselves *ordained* them by 'laying on of hands. So we read throughout the Acts of the Apostles.

"They who have received this gift, ought not to use it as a trade to get money thereby. Yet it may be lawful for such to receive what may be needful to them for food and clothing."

In this there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

"We judge it no ways unlawful, for a woman to preach in the assemblies of God's people."

In this there is a manifest difference. For the Apostle Paul saith expressly, 'Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak.—And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.' 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35.

Robert Barclay indeed says, 'Paul here only reproves the inconsiderate and talkative women.' But the text says no such thing. It evidently speaks of women in general. Again, the Apostle Paul saith to Timothy, 'Let your women learn in silence with all subjection. For I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, (which public teaching necessarily implies,) but to be in silence.' (1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.) To this Robert Barclay makes only that harmless reply; 'We think this is not any ways repugnant to this doctrine.' Not repugnant to this, 'I do not suffer a woman to teach? Then I know not what is.'

"But a woman 'laboured with Paul in the work of the gospel.' " Yea! but not in the way he had himself expressly forbidden.

"But Joel foretold, 'Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.' And 'Philip had four daughters which prophesied.' And the Apostle himself directs women to *prophesy*; only with their 'heads covered.'" Very good. But how do you prove that prophesying in any of these places means preaching?

XI. "All true worship to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving of his own Spirit. We ought not to pray or preach where and when we will, but where and when we are moved thereto.

by his Spirit. All other worship, both praises, prayers, and preachings, which man sets about in his own will, and at his own appointment, which he can begin and end at pleasure, do, or leave undone, as himself sees meet, are but superstitions, will-worship, and abominable idolatries."

Here lies one of the main differences between Quakerism and Christianity. It is true indeed, that "all true worship to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving of his own Spirit;" or, (to speak plainly,) that we cannot truly worship God, unless his Spirit move or incline our hearts. It is equally true, that "we ought to pray and preach, only where and when we are moved thereto by his Spirit." But I fear you do not in any wise understand, what the being moved by his Spirit means. God moves man whom he has made a reasonable creature, according to the reason which he has given him. He moves him by his understanding, as well as his affections, by light as well as by heat. He moves him to do this or that by conviction, full as often as by desire. Accordingly, you are as really moved by the Spirit when he convinces you, you ought to feed him that is hungry, as when he gives you ever so strong an impulse, desire, or inclination so to do.

In like manner, you are as really moved by the Spirit to pray, whether it be in public or private, when you have a conviction it is the will of God you should, as when you have the strongest impulse upon your heart. And he does truly move you to preach, when in his light you see light clearly satisfying you it is his will; as much as when you feel the most vehement impulse or desire to 'hold forth the words of eternal life.'

Now let us consider the main proposition. "All worship which man sets about in his own will, and at his own appointment."—Hold! That is quite another thing. It may be at his own appointment, and yet not in his own will. For instance; it is not my own will to preach at all. It is quite contrary to my will. Many a time have I cried out, 'Lord, send by whom thou wilt send. Only send not me!' But I am moved by the Spirit of God to preach: he clearly *shows* me it is his will I should; and that I should do it *when* and *where* the greatest number of poor sinners may be gathered together. Moved by him, I give up my will, and appoint a time and place, when by his power I trust to speak in his name.

How widely different, then, from true Christianity is that amazing sentence, "All praises, prayers, and preachings, which man can begin and end at his pleasure, do, or leave undone, as himself sees meet. are superstition, will-worship, and abominable idolatry, in the sight of God!"

There is not one tittle of Scripture for this; nor yet is there any sound reason. When you take it for granted, "In all preachings which a man begins or ends at his pleasure, does, or leaves undone, as he sees meet," he is not moved by the Spirit of God, you are too hasty a great deal. It may be by the Spirit, that he sees meet to do, or leave it undone. How will you prove that it is not? His pleasure may depend on the pleasure of God, signified to him by his Spi-

rit. His appointing this or that time or place, does in nowise prove the contrary. Prove me the proposition if you can, "Every man who preaches or prays at an appointed time, preaches or prays in his own will, and not by the Spirit."

That all such preaching is will-worship, in the sense St. Paul uses the word, is no more true than that it is murder. That it is superstition, remains also to be proved. That it is "abominable idolatry," how will you reconcile with what follows but a few lines after? "However it might please God, who winked at the times of ignorance, to raise some breathings and answer them." What! Answer the breathings of *abominable idolatry*! I observe how warily this is worded. But it allows enough. If God ever raised and answered those prayers, which were made at set times, then those prayers could not be "abominable idolatry."

Again, that prayers and preachings, though made at appointed times, may yet proceed from the Spirit of God, may be clearly proved from those other words of Robert Barclay himself. p. 389

"That preaching, (or prayer,) which is not done by the actings and movings of God's Spirit, cannot beget faith." Most true. But preaching and prayer at *appointed* times, have begotten faith both at Bristol and Paulton. (You know well.) Therefore that preaching and prayer, though at *appointed* times, was "done by the actings and movings of God's Spirit."

It follows, that this preaching and prayer, were far from "abominable idolatry." That expression can never be defended. Say, It was a rash word, and give it up.

In truth, from the beginning to the end, you set this matter upon a wrong foundation. It is not on this circumstance, "The being at *set* times or not that the acceptableness of our prayers depends: but on the intention and tempers with which we pray." He that prays in faith, at whatsoever time, is heard. In every time and place, God accepts him who 'lifts up holy hands, without wrath or doubting. The charge of superstition, therefore, returns upon yourself. For what gross superstition is this to lay so much stress on an indifferent circumstance, and so little on *faith* and the *love of God*!

But to proceed. "We confess singing of psalms, to be a part of God's worship, and very sweet and refreshful, when it proceeds from a true sense of God's love. But as for formal singing, it has no foundation in Scripture."

In this there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

But let it be observed here, that the Quakers in general cannot be excused if this be true. For if they "confess singing of psalms to be a part of God's worship," how dare they either condemn or neglect it!

"Silence is a principal part of God's worship: i. e. men's 'sitting silent together, ceasing from all outwards, from their own words, and actings, in the natural will and comprehension, and feeling after the inward seed of life.'"

In this there is a manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity

This is will-worship, if there be any such thing under heaven. For there is neither command, nor example for it in Scripture. Robert Barclay indeed refers to abundance of scriptures, to prove it is a command. But as he did not see good to set them down at length, I will take the trouble to transcribe a few of them.

‘Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart.’ Psalm xxvii. 14. ‘Rest in the Lord and wait patiently; fret not thyself at him who prospereth in his way.’ Psalm xxxvii. 7. ‘Wait on the Lord and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land.’ ver. 34. ‘Say not thou, I will recompense evil; but wait on the Lord and he shall save thee.’ Prov. xx. 23.

By these one may judge of the rest. But how amazing is this? What are all these to the point in question?

For *examples of silent meetings* he refers to the five texts following:

‘They were all with one accord in one place.’ Acts ii. 1. ‘So they sat down with him seven days and seven nights, and none spake a word unto him: for they saw that his grief was very great.’ Job ii. 13. ‘Then were assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of God—And I sat astonished until the evening sacrifice.’ Ezra ix. 4. ‘Then came certain of the elders of Israel unto me, and sat before me.’ Ezek. xiv. 1, and xxiii.

Was it possible for Robert Barclay to believe, that any one of these texts was any thing to the purpose? The odd expressions here also, “Ceasing from all outwards, in the natural will and comprehension,” and “feeling after the inward seed of life,” are borrowed from Jacob Behmen.

XII. “As there is one Lord and one faith, so there is one baptism.” Yea, one outward baptism: which you deny. Here, therefore, is another difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

But “if those whom John baptized with water, were not baptized with the baptism of Christ, then the baptism of water, is not the baptism of Christ.”—This is a mere quibble. The sequel ought to be, “Then *that* baptism of water, (i. e. John’s baptism,) was not the baptism of Christ.” Who says it was?

Yet Robert Barclay is so fond of this argument that he repeats it almost in the same words. “If John who administered the baptism of water, yet did not baptize with the baptism of Christ, then the baptism of water is not the baptism of Christ.” This is the same fallacy still. The sequel here also should be, “Then *that* baptism of water was not the baptism of Christ.”

He repeats it, with a little variation, a third time, “Christ himself saith, ‘John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.’” He repeats it a fourth time: “Peter saith, ‘Then remembered I the word of the Lord, John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.’ From all which it follows, that such as John baptized with water, yet were not baptized with the baptism of Christ.” Very true. But this proves neither more nor less than that the baptism of John differed from the baptism of Christ. And so doubtless it did: not indeed as to the ‘outward sign,’ but as to the inward grace.

XIII. "The breaking of bread by Christ with his ~~disciples~~ was but a figure, and ceases in such as have obtained the substance." Here is another manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity. From the very time that our Lord gave that command, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' all Christians throughout the habitable world, did 'eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him.'

Allowing, therefore, all that Robert Barclay affirms, for eighteen or twenty pages together, viz. 1. That believers partake of the body and blood of Christ in a spiritual manner; 2. That this may be done, in some sense, when we are not eating bread and drinking wine; 3. That the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Papists, differ from each other with regard to the Lord's Supper; and, 4. That many of them have spoken wildly and absurdly concerning it: yet all this will never prove, that we need not do, what Christ has expressly commanded to be done; and what the whole body of Christians in all ages have done, in obedience to that command.

That there was such a command, you cannot deny. But you say, "It is ceased in such as have obtained the substance."

St. Paul knew nothing of this. He says nothing of its ceasing, in all he writes of it to the Corinthians. Nay, quite the contrary. He says, 'As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.' "O," say you, "the Apostle means his inward coming, which some of the Corinthians had not yet known." Nay, this cannot be his meaning. For he saith to all the Corinthian communicants, 'Ye do show the Lord's death, till he come.' Now if he was not come (spiritually) in some of these, undoubtedly he was in others. Consequently he cannot be speaking here of that coming, which in many of them, at least, was already past. It remains, that he speaks of his coming in the clouds, to judge both the quick and dead.

In what Robert Barclay teaches concerning the Scriptures, Justification, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, lies the main difference between Quakerism and Christianity.

XIV "Since God hath assumed to himself the dominion of the conscience, who alone can rightly instruct and govern it, therefore it is not lawful for any whatsoever, to force the consciences of others." In this there is no difference at all between Quakerism and Christianity.

XV "It is not lawful for Christians to give or receive titles of honour, as, your majesty, your lordship, &c."—In this there is a difference between Quakerism and Christianity. Christians may give titles of honour, such as are usually annexed to certain offices. Thus St. Paul gives the usual title of *most noble* to the Roman governor. Robert Barclay indeed says, "he would not have called him such, if he had not been *truly noble*: as indeed he was, in that he would not give way to the fury of the Jews against him."

The Scripture says quite otherwise: that he *did* give way to the fury of the Jews against him. I read, 'Festus willing to do the Jews a pleasure,' (who had 'desired a favour against him, that he would send for him to Jerusalem, lying in wait in the way to kill him,')

said to Paul, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me? Then said Paul, I stand at Cæsar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. If I have done any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them.'

Hence it plainly appears, that Festus was a very wicked person, one who to 'do the Jews a pleasure,' would have betrayed the innocent blood. But although St. Paul was not ignorant of his character, still he calls him *most noble* Festus, giving him the title of his office; which indeed was neither more nor less than saying, "Governor Festus," or "King Agrippa."

It is therefore mere superstition to scruple this. And it is, if possible, greater superstition still, to scruple saying, *You*, *Vous*, or *Ihr*, whether to one or more persons, as is the common way of speaking in any country. It is this which fixes the language of every nation. It is this which makes me say *you* in England, *vous* in France, and *hr* in Germany, rather than *thou*, *tu*, or *du*, rather than Σv , Σe , or Σn . (which if we speak strictly, is the only scriptural language; not *thou* or *thee* any more than *you*.) But the placing religion in such things as these, is such egregious trifling, as naturally tends to make all religion stink in the nostrils of Infidels and Heathens.

And yet this, by a far greater abuse of words than that you would reform, you call "the plain language." O my friend! He uses the plain language, who speaks the truth from his heart. Not he who says *thee* or *thou*, and at the mean time will dissemble or flatter, like the rest of the world.

"It is not lawful for Christians to kneel or bow the body, or uncover the head to any man." If this is not lawful, then some law of God forbids it. Can you show me that law? If you cannot, then scrupling this is another plain instance of superstition, not Christianity.

"It is not lawful for a Christian to use superfluities in apparel: as neither, to use such games, sports, and plays, under the notion of recreations, as are not consistent with gravity and godly fear." As to both these propositions, there is no difference between Quakerism and Christianity. Only observe, touching the former, that the sin of "superfluous apparel," lies chiefly in the *superfluous expense*. To make it therefore a point of conscience, to differ from others, as to the *shape* or *colour* of your apparel, is mere superstition: let the difference lie in the *price*, that you may have the more wherewithal to clothe them that have none.

"It is not lawful for Christians to swear before a magistrate, nor to fight in any cause." Whatever becomes of the latter proposition, the former is no part of Christianity: for Christ himself answered upon oath before a magistrate. Yea, he would not answer till he was put to his oath; till the high priest said unto him, 'I adjure thee by the living God.'

Friend, you have an honest heart, but a weak head: you have a zeal, but not according to knowledge. You were zealous once for

the love of God and man ; for holiness of heart and holiness of life. You are now zealous for particular forms of speaking, for a set of phrases and opinions. Once your zeal was against ungodliness and unrighteousness, against evil tempers and evil works. Now it is against forms of prayer, against singing psalms or hymns, against appointing times of praying or preaching ; against saying *you* to a single person, uncovering your head, or having too many buttons on your coat. O what a fall is here ! What poor trifles are these, that now well nigh engross your thoughts ! Come back, come back, to the weightier matters of the law, spiritual, rational, scriptural religion. No longer waste your time and strength in beating the air, in vain controversies and strife of words : but bend your whole soul to the growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the continually advancing in that holiness, without which you cannot see the Lord.

AN EXTRACT OF A LETTER

TO THE

REV. MR. LAW ;

OCCASIONED BY SOME OF HIS LATE WRITINGS.

REV. SIR,

IN matters of religion I regard no writings but the inspired. Tauler, Behmen, and a whole army of mystic authors are with me nothing to St. Paul. In every point I appeal to the Law and the Testimony, and value no authority but this. At a time when I was in great danger of not valuing this authority enough, you made that important observation, "I see where your mistake lies. You would have a philosophical religion ; but there can be no such thing. Religion is the most plain, simple thing in the world. It is only, 'We love him, because he first loved us. So far as you add philosophy to religion, just so far you spoil it.'" This remark I have never forgotten since. And I trust in God I never shall.

But have not you ? Permit me, Sir, to speak plainly. Have you ever thought of it since ? Is there a writer in England who so continually blends philosophy with religion ? Even in tracts on *The Spirit of Prayer*, and *The Spirit of Love*, wherein, from the titles of them, one would expect to find no more of philosophy, than in the epistles of St. John. Concerning which, give me leave to observe in general, 1. That the whole of it is utterly superfluous : a man may be full both of prayer and love, and not know a word of this hypothesis : 2. The whole of this hypothesis is unproved ; it is all pre-

carious, all uncertain : 3. The whole hypothesis has a dangerous tendency. It naturally leads men off from plain practical religion, and fills them with the knowledge that puffeth up, instead of the love that edifieth ; and, 4. It is often flatly contradictory to Scripture, to reason, and to itself.

But over and above this superfluous, uncertain, dangerous, irrational, and unscriptural philosophy, have not you lately grieved many who are not strangers to the spirit of prayer or love, by advancing tenets in religion, some of which they think are unsupported by Scripture, some even repugnant to it ? Allow me, Sir, first to touch upon your philosophy, and then to speak freely concerning these.

I. As to your philosophy, the main of your theory respects, 1. Things antecedent to the creation ; 2. The creation itself ; 3. Adam in Paradise ; 4. The fall of man.

I do not undertake formally to refute what you have asserted on any of these heads. I dare not : I cannot answer either to God or man such an employment of my time. I shall only give a sketch of this strange system, and ask a few obvious questions.

And, 1. Of the things antecedent to the creation.

* " All that can be conceived is God, or nature, or creature." †

Is nature created, or not created ? It must be one or the other : for there is no medium. If not created, is it not God ? If created, is it not a creature ? How then can there be three, God, nature, and creature ? Since nature must coincide either with God or creature.

" Nature is in itself a hungry, wrathful fire of life." ‡—" Nature is and can be only a desire. Desire is the very being of nature." § " Nature is only a desire, because it is for the sake of something else. Nature is only a torment ; because it cannot help itself to that which it wants." || " Nature is the outward manifestation of the invisible glories of God." ¶

Is not the last of these definitions contradictory to all that precede ? —If desire is the very being of nature ; if it is a torment, a hungry wrathful fire : how is it " the outward manifestation of the invisible glories of God ? " " Nature as well as God is antecedent to all creatures." ** " There is an eternal nature, as universal and as unlimited as God." †† Is then nature God ? Or are there two eternal, universal, infinite beings ?

" Nothing is before eternal nature but God." ‡‡ " Nothing but ? " Is any thing before that which is eternal ? —But how is this grand account of nature consistent with what you say elsewhere ?

" Nature, and darkness, and self, are but three different expressions for one and the same thing." §§ " Nature has all evil and no evil in it." Yea, || " Nature, self, or darkness, has not only no evil in it, but is the only ground of all good." O rare darkness !

" Nature has seven chief properties, and can have neither more nor

* Mr. Law's words are enclosed all along in inverted commas.

† Spirit of Prayer, P. II. p. 33. † Ibid. p. 34. § Sp. of Love, P. I. p. 20. || P. 34
P. II. p. 62. ** P. 59. †† P. 64. †† Ibid. §§ P. 181. ||| P. 192.

less, because it is a birth from the Deity in nature." (Is nature a birth from the Deity in nature? Is this sense? If it be, what kind of proof is it? Is it not *ignotum per aequum ignotum?*) "For God is tri-une and nature is tri-une." ("Nature is tri-une." Is not this flat begging the question?) "And hence arise properties, three and three." (Nay, why not nine and nine?) "And that which brings these three and three into union is another property."* Why so? Why may it not be two, or five, or nine? Is it not rather the will and power of God?

"The three first properties of nature are the whole essence of that desire, which is, and is called nature." (p. 69.) How? Are the properties of a thing the same as the essence of it? What confusion is this! But if they were, can a part of its properties be the whole essence of it?

"The three first properties of nature are attraction, resistance, and whirling. In these three properties of the desire, you see the reason of the three great laws of matter and motion, and need not be told, that Sir Isaac ploughed with Jacob Behmen's heifer." (p. 37.) Just as much as Milton ploughed with Francis Quarles's heifer.

How does it appear, that these are any of the properties of nature? If you mean by nature any thing distinct from matter? And how are they the properties of desire? What a jumbling of dissonant notions is here!

"The fourth property," (you affirm, not prove,) "is called fire: the fifth the form of light and love." (What do you mean by the form of love? Are light and love one and the same thing?) "The sixth, sound or understanding." (Are then sound and understanding the same thing?) "The seventh, a life of triumphing joy." (p. 58.) Is then a life of triumphing joy, "that which brings the three and three properties into union?" If so, how can it be "the result of that union?" Do these things hang together?

To conclude this head. You say, "attraction is an incessant working of three contrary properties, drawing, resisting, and whirling!" (p. 200.) That is in plain terms, (a discovery worthy of Jacob Behmen, and yet not borrowed by Sir Isaac!) "Drawing is incessant drawing; resistance, and whirling."

II. Of the creation:

You put these words, with many more equally important, into the mouth of God himself!

"Angels first inhabited the region which is now taken up by the sun and the planets that move round him. It was then all a glassy sea, in which perpetual scenes of light and glory were ever rising and changing in obedience to their call. Hence they fancied they had infinite power, and resolved to abjure all submission to God. In that moment they were whirled down into their own dark, fiery, working powers. And in that moment the glassy sea, by the wrathful workings of these spirits, was broke in pieces, and became a chaos

of fire and wrath, thickness, and darkness." Sp. of Prayer, P. I. p. 14, &c.

I would inquire upon this, 1. Is it well for a man to take such liberty with the Most High God ? 2. Is not this being immeasurably wise above that which is written ? Wiser than all the Prophets and all the Apostles put together ? 3. How can any thing of this be proved ? Why thus: " 'Darkness was upon the face of the deep.' What can this mean, but that the fall of angels brought desolation into the very place of this world ?" P. II. p. 49. What a proof !

Secondly, "The Scripture shows, that the Spirit of God entering into this darkness," (that is, into the very place where Satan reigned before,) "brought forth a new world." p. 50.

Where does it show that this darkness was the place where Satan reigned ? I cannot find it in *my* Bible.

Thirdly, "How could the Devil be called, 'The Prince of this world,' if it was not once his own kingdom ?" (ibid.) May he not be so called, because he *now* reigns therein ? Is he not *now* 'the ruler of the darkness,' or wickedness, 'of this world ?'

Fourthly, "Had it not been their own kingdom, the devils could have no power here. This may pass for a demonstration, That this is the very place in which the angels fell." p. 51. I doubt, it will not pass. Cannot God permit Satan to exert his power, wherever it pleaseth him ?

Hitherto then we have not a grain of sound proof. Yet you pronounce with all peremptoriness, "The grounds of true religion cannot be truly known but by going so far back as *this* fall of angels." p. 37. 38. Cannot ? Positively, cannot ? How few men in England, in Europe, can or do go back so far ? And are there none but these, no not one, who knows the grounds of true religion ?

"It was their revolt which brought wrath, and fire, and thickness, and darkness into nature." (ibid.) If it was sin that brought fire into the world, (which is hard to prove) did it bring darkness ? And thickness too ? But if it did what harm is there in either ? Is not thickness as good in its place as thinness ? And as to darkness you say yourself "It has not only no evil in it, but is the only ground of all possible good."

Touching creation in general you aver, "A creation out of nothing is no better sense than a creation into nothing." (p. 60.) "A creation into nothing" is a contradiction in terms. Can you say a creation out of nothing is so ? It is indeed tautology: since the single term creation is equivalent with production out of nothing. "That all things were created out of nothing, has not the least tittle of Scripture to support it." (p. 55.) Is it not supported (as all the Christian church has thought hitherto) by the very first verse of Genesis ?

"Nay, it is a fiction big with the grossest absurdities. It is full of horrid consequences. It separates every thing from God. It leaves no relation between God and the creature. For, (mark the proof !) "if it is created out of nothing, it cannot have something of God in it." (p. 58.) The consequence is not clear. Till this is made good, can any of those propositions be allowed ?

“ Nature is the first birth of God.” Did God create it or not ? If not, how came it out of him ? If he did, did he create it out of something, or nothing ?

“ St. Paul says, All things are of, or out of God.”—And what does this prove, but that God is the cause of all things ?

“ The materiality of the angelic kingdom was spiritual.” (Sp. of Prayer, P. II. p. 27.) What is spiritual materiality ? Is it not much the same with immaterial materiality ?—“ This spiritual materiality brought forth the heavenly flesh and blood of angels.” (p. 57.) That angels have bodies you affirm elsewhere. But are you sure, they have flesh and blood ? Are not the angels spirits ? And surely a ‘ spirit hath not flesh and blood.’

“ The whole glassy sea was a mirror of beauteous forms, colours, and sounds perpetually springing up, having also fruits and vegetables, but not gross, as the fruits of the world. This was continually bringing forth new figures of life ; not animals, but ideal forms of the endless divisibility of life.” (P. I. p. 18, 19.) This likewise is put into the mouth of God. But is nonsense from the Most High ?

What less is “ a mirror of beauteous sounds ?” And what are “ figures of life ?” Are they alive or dead ? Or between both ? As a man may be between sleeping and waking ? What are “ ideal forms of endless divisibility of life ?” Are they the same with those forms of stones, one of which Maraton took up (while he was seeking Yaratilda,) to throw at the form of a lion ? See the Spectator.

“ The glassy sea being become thick and dark, the spirit converted its fire and wrath into sun and stars, its dross and darkness into earth, its mobility into air, its moisture into water.” P. II. p. 29.

Was wrath converted into sun or stars ? Or a little of it bestowed on both ? How was darkness turned into earth ? Or mobility into air ? Has not fire more mobility than this ? Did there need omnipotence, to convert fire into fire ? Into the Sun ? Or moisture into water ?

“ Darkness was absolutely unknown to the angels till they fell. Hence it appears, that darkness is the ground of the materiality of nature.” (p. 33.) Appears ? To whom ? Nothing appears to me, but the proving *ignotum per ignotius*.

“ All life is a desire.” (Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 198.) Every desire, as *such*, is, and must be made up of contrariety.” (ibid.) “ God’s bringing a sensible creature into existence, is the bringing the power of desire into a creaturely state.” Does not all this require a little more proof ? And not a little illustration ?

“ Hard and soft, thick and thin, could have no existence till nature lost its first purity. And this is the one true origin of all the materiality of this world. Else nothing thick or hard could ever have been.” (P. I. p. 21.) Does not this call for much proof ? Since most people believe, God created matter, merely because ‘ so it seemed good in his sight.’

But you add a kind of proof. “ How comes a flint to be so hard and dark ? It is because the meekness and fluidity of the light, air,

and water are not in it." (ibid.) The meekness of light, air, and water! What is that? Is air or water capable of virtue?

"The first property of nature is a constraining, attracting, and coagulating power." (p. 24.) I wait the proof of this.

"God brought gross matter out of the sinful properties of nature, that thereby the fallen angels might lose all their power over them." (p. 27.) And have they lost all power over them? Is Satan no longer 'Prince of the power of the air'?

"As all matter is owing to the first property of nature, which is an astringing; compressing desire." (p. 28.)—Stop here, Sir. I totally deny, that any unintelligent being is capable of any *desire* at all. And yet this gross, capital mistake runs through your whole theory.

"The fourth property is fire." (p. 49.) Where is the proof?—"which changes the properties of nature into an heavenly state." (p. 48.) Proof again. "The conjunction of God and nature brings forth fire." This needs the most proof of all.

"Every right kindled fire must give forth light." Why? "Because the eternal fire is the effect of supernatural light." Nay then *light* should rather give forth *fire*. "The fire of the soul and that of the body has but one nature." (p. 52.) Can either Behmen or Spinoza prove this?

III. Of Adam in Paradise.

"Paradise is an heavenly birth of life." (Sp. of Prayer, P I. p. 6.) How does this definition explain the thing defined?

"Adam had at first both an heavenly and an earthly body. Into the latter was the spirit of this world breathed, and in this spirit and body did the heavenly spirit and body of Adam dwell." (p. 7.) So he had originally two bodies and two souls! This will need abundance of proof. "The spirit and body of this world was the medium, through which he was to have commerce with this world." The proof. "But it was no more alive in him, than Satan and the serpent were alive in him at his first creation. Good and evil were then only in his outward body and in the outward world." What was there evil in the world, and even in Adam, together with Satan and the serpent, at his first creation? "But they were kept unactive by the power of the heavenly man within him." Did this case cover the earthly man? Or the earthly case the heavenly?

But "he had power to choose, whether he would use his outward body only as a mean of opening the outward world to him."—So it was not quite *unactive* neither: "or of opening the bestial life in himself. (p. 9.) Till this was opened in him, nothing in this outward world, no more than his own outward body:" (so now it is *unactive* again,) "could act upon him, make any impressions upon him, or raise any sensations in him; neither had he any feeling of good or evil from it." All this being entirely new, we must beg clear and full proof of it.

"God said to man at his creation, rule thou over this imperfect, perishing world, without partaking of its impure nature." (p. 21.) Was not the world then at first *perfect* in its kind? Was it *impure*

then? Or would it have *perished* if man had not sinned? And are we sure that God spake thus?

"The end God proposed in the creation, was the restoring all things to their glorious state." (P. II. p. 61.) In the creation? Was not this rather the end which he proposed in the redemption?

"Adam was created to keep what is called the curse, covered and overcome by Paradise. And as Paradise concealed and overcame all the evil in the elements, so Adam's heavenly man concealed from him all the evil of the earthly-nature that was under it." (p. 62.) Can we believe that there was any *evil* in man from the creation, if we believe the Bible?

"Our own good spirit is the very Spirit of God: and yet not God, but the Spirit of God kindled into a creaturely form." Is there any meaning in these words? And how are they consistent with those that follow? "This spirit is so related to God, as my breath is to the air." (p. 195.) Nay, if so, your spirit *is* God. For your breath *is* air.

"That Adam had at first the nature of an angel is plain from hence, that he was both male and female in one person. Now this (the being both male and female) is the very perfection of the angelic nature." (p. 65.) Naturalists say, that *snails* have this *perfection*. But who can prove, that *angels* have?

You attempt to prove it thus: "in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels." Here we are told, 1. That the being male and female in one person, is the very nature of angels. 2. That man shall be so too at the resurrection. Therefore he was so at first." (p. 66.)

Indeed, we are not told here, that angels are hermaphrodites. No, nor any thing like it. The whole passage is, 'They who are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels;' (Luke xx. 35, 36,) namely, (not in being male and female, but) in this, that they 'cannot die any more.' This is the indisputable meaning of the words. So this whole proof vanishes into air.

You have one more thought, full as new as this. "All earthly beasts are but creaturely eruptions of the disorder that is broken out from the fallen spiritual world. So earthly serpents are but transitory out-births of covetousness, envy, pride, and wrath." (Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 207.) How shall we reconcile this with the Mosaic account? 'And God said, Let the earth bring forth cattle, and creeping thing, and beast. And God made the beast of the earth; and God saw that it was good.' Gen. i. 24, 25. Does any thing here intimate, that beasts or serpents literally crept out of the womb of sin? And what have serpents in particular, to do with covetousness? Or indeed with envy, unless in poetic fables?

IV Of the Fall of Man.

"Adam had lost much of his perfection, before Eve was taken out of him. 'It is not good,' said God, that 'man should be alone.' This shows that Adam had now made *that* not to be good which

God saw to be good when he created him." (Sp. of Pr. p. 74.) Nay, does it show either more or less than this, that it was not conducive to the wise ends God had in view, for man to remain single?

God then divided the human nature, into a male and female creature. Otherwise man would have brought forth his own likeness out of himself, in the same manner as he had a birth from God. But Adam let in an adulterous love of the world: by this his virginity was lost, and he had no longer a power of bringing forth a birth from himself." (p. 75.) We have no shadow of proof for all this.

"This state of inability is called his falling into a deep sleep." (p. 76.) How does this agree with 'The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam?' Gen. ii. 21.

"God took his Eve out of him, as a lesser evil to avoid a greater. For it was a less folly, to love the female part of himself, than to love things lower than himself." p. 77.

Who can extract this out of the words of Moses? Who can reconcile it with the words of our Lord? 'He who made them at the beginning' (not a word of any previous fall) 'made them male and female. And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife.' Matt. xix. 4, 5. Is there any intimation, that for a man to love his wife, is only less folly than to love the world? 'A man ought so to love his wife, even as Christ the church.' Is there any folly in the love of Christ to the church?

"Marriage came in by Adam's falling from his first perfection." (p. 78.) Does this account do honour to that institution? Any more than that memorable saying of an eminent mystic, "Marriage is but licensed whoredom."

"Had Adam stood, no Eve would have been taken out of him. But from Eve God raised that angelic man, whom Adam should have brought forth without Eve, who is called The Second Adam, as being both male and female." (p. 79.) Many things here want proof. How does it appear, 1. That Eve would not have been, had Adam stood? 2. That had he stood, he would have brought forth the Second Adam without Eve? 3. That Christ was both male and female? And, 4. That he was on this account called The Second Adam?

"The Second Adam is now to do that which the first should have done." (p. 84.) Is he to do no more than that? No more than a mere creature should have done? Then what need is there of his being any more than a creature? What need of his being God?

"Our having from him a new heavenly flesh and blood, raised in us by his spiritual power, is the strongest proof, that we should have been born of Adam by the same spiritual power." (p. 85.) Had Adam then the very same spiritual power, which Christ had? And would he, if he had stood, have transmitted to us the very same benefit? Surely none that believes the Christian revelation will aver this in cool blood!

"From Adam's desire turned toward the world, the earth got a power of giving forth an evil tree. It was his will which opened a passage for the evil hid in the earth," (I know not how it came

there before Adam fell,) "to bring forth a tree in its own likeness. No sooner was it brought forth, than God assured him that death was hid in it: a plain proof that this tree was not from God, but from a power in the earth, which could not show itself, till Adam desired to taste something which was not paradisiacal." p. 96.

This is the marvellous in the highest degree, and affords many questions not very easy to be answered. But waiving all these, can any thing be more flatly contradictory to the Mosaic account? We read there, 'The Lord God formed man.' (Gen. ii. 7.) 'And the Lord planted a garden.' (ver. 8.) 'And out of the ground made the Lord God every tree to grow that is pleasant to the sight and good for food; the tree of life, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.' (ver. 9.) Is it not here plainly taught, that this tree was from God? That not the desire of Adam, but the Lord God made this tree to grow, as well as the tree of life? And when was it that God gave him that solemn warning, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die?' (ver. 17.) Not as soon as that tree was brought forth: but when Adam was put into the garden.

"At first all the natural properties of man's creaturely life were hid in God, just as the natural qualities of darkness are hid, till glorified by the light." (Spirit of Love, part II. p. 181.) Nay, were they not sufficiently hid by the heavenly man? Need they be hid over and over?

"But when man fell; all these properties broke forth, just as the darkness when it has lost the light, must show forth its own coldness, horror, and other uncomfortable qualities." *Exemplum placet!* But are either coldness or horror, natural qualities of darkness? If so, they must be inseparable from it. But who will affirm this?

"Darkness, though contrary to light, is yet absolutely necessary to it. Without this no manifestation or visibility of light could possibly be." This is absolutely new and surprising. But how is it to be proved?

Thus: "God dwelleth in the light which no man can approach. Therefore light cannot be manifested to man but by darkness." (p. 189.) Ah poor consequence! Would not the same text just as well prove transubstantiation?

"Light and darkness do every thing, whether good or evil, that is done in man. Light is all power, light is all things, and nothing," (ibid.) I cannot conceive what ideas you affix to the terms, light and darkness. But I forget. You except against ideas. Can you teach us to think without them?

Once more. You say, "Darkness is a positive thing, and has a strength and substantiality in it." (p. 182.) I have scarcely met with a greater friend to darkness, except "the illuminated Jacob Behmen."

But, Sir, have you not done him an irreparable injury? I do not mean by misrepresenting his sentiments, (though some of his profound admirers are positive, that you misunderstand and murder him throughout;) but by dragging him out of his awful obscurity; by

pouring light upon his venerable darkness? Men may admire the deepness of the well, and the excellence of the water it contains. But if some officious person puts a light into it, it will appear to be both very shallow and very dirty.

I could not have borne to spend so many words on so egregious trifles, but that they are mischievous trifles:

*Hæ nugæ seria ducunt
In mala.*

This is dreadfully apparent in your own case, (I would not speak, but that I dare not refrain,) whom notwithstanding your uncommon abilities, they have led astray in things of the greatest importance. Bad philosophy has, by insensible degrees, paved the way for bad divinity: in consequence of this miserable hypothesis, you advance many things in religion also, some of which are unsupported by Scripture, some even repugnant to it.

II. Some of these I shall now mention with the utmost plainness, as knowing for whom, and before whom I speak.

And, 1. You deny the omnipotence of God.

You say, "As no seeing eye could be created, unless there was antecedent to it, a natural visibility of things."—Why not? Why might not visible things be created at the same instant with it?—"So no creature could come into any natural life, unless such a state of nature was antecedent to it." (p. 60.) "All that God does, is and must be done in and by the powers of nature." (p. 135.) What then did it avail, that, as you elsewhere say, God was before nature? He not only could not then do all things, but he could do nothing, till nature existed. But if so, how came nature itself, this second eternal, to exist at all?

"There cannot possibly be any other difference between created beings, than arises from that out of which they were created." (p. 60.) Why not? Who will stay the hand of the Almighty, or say unto him, What dost thou?

"No fruits or vegetables could have sprung up in the divided elements, but because they are parts of that glassy sea, where angelical fruits grew before." (Spirit of Prayer, part I. p. 19.) But how came those fruits to grow before? How came they to grow in the glassy sea? Were they not produced out of nothing at first? If not, God was not before nature. If they were, cannot he still produce out of nothing whatsoever pleaseth him?

"All outward nature being fallen from heaven"—That we deny—"must, as well as it can, do and work as it did in heaven." (p. 20.) "As well as it can!" What can it do without God? Who upholdeth all things by the word of his power! And what can it not do, if he pleaseth? Or rather, what cannot he do, with or without it?

"Matter could not possibly be, but from sin." (Spirit of Love, part I. p. 23.) That is, in very plain terms, God could not have created matter, if Satan had not sinned! "God could not create

man with a soul and a body, unless there was such a thing as nature, antecedent to the creation of man." p. 20.

Why could not God do this? Because "body and spirit are not two separate things, but are only the inward and outward condition of one and the same being. Every creature must have its own body, and cannot be without it. For its body is that"—Who would have thought it?—"which makes it manifest to itself. It cannot know, either that it is, or what it is, but by its own body!" (p. 32.) What a heap of bold assertions is here, to curb Omnipotence! And not one of them has a tittle of proof, unless one can prove the other.

But we have more still. "The body (of any creature) has nothing of its own, but is solely the outward manifestation of that which is inwardly in the soul. Every animal has nothing in its outward form or shape, but that which is the form and growth of its spirit. As no number can be any thing else, but that which the units contained in it make it to be, so no body can be any thing else but the coagulation or sum total of those properties of nature that are coagulated in it." p. 33.

Astonishing! What a discovery is this! That a body is only a curdled spirit! That our bodies are only the sum total of our spiritual properties: and that the form of every man's body is only the form of his spirit made visible!

"Every spirit manifests its own nature by that body which proceeds from it as its own birth." (Spirit of Love, part H. p. 17.) Does the body then grow out of the spirit, as the hair and nails grow out of the body? And this, in consequence of the "powers of nature," distinct from the power and will of God?

To abridge God of his power, after creation, as well as before it, you affirm farther, "This is an axiom that cannot be shaken, nothing can rise higher than its first created nature; and therefore an angel at last must have been an angel at first. Do you think it possible for an ox to be changed into a rational philosopher? Yet this is as possible as for one who has only by creation the life of this world, to be changed into an angel of heaven. The life of this world can reach no farther than this world: no omnipotence of God can carry it farther. Therefore if man is to be an angel at last, he must have been created an angel: because no creature can possibly have any other life or higher degree of life, than that which his creation brought forth in him." Spirit of Prayer, part H. p. 81.

I have quoted this passage at some length, that the sense of it may appear beyond dispute. But what divinity! And what reasoning to support it! Can God "raise nothing higher than its first created state?" Is it not possible for him to "change an ox" or a stone into a rational philosopher, or a child of Abraham? To change a man or a worm into an angel of heaven? Poor omnipotence which cannot do this! Whether he will, or not, is another question. But if he cannot do it, how can he be said to do 'whatsoever pleaseth him, in heaven, and in earth, and in the sea, and in all deep places?'

Thus does your attachment to a miserable philosophy, lead you to deny the almighty power of God.

H. It leads you, in the second place, to deny his justice, to abridge this no less than his power.

This I may be permitted to consider more at large ; because though it was allowed by all the wiser Heathens of past ages, yet it is now one main hinge on which the controversy between Christianity and Deism turns. To convert a thousand Deists, therefore, by giving up this point, with the doctrine of Justification which is built upon it, is little more than it would be to convert as many Jews, by allowing the Messiah is not yet come. It is converting them by allowing all they contend for ; by granting them the main point in question. Consequently it is no other than *establishing* Deism, while it pretends to overturn it.

I would greatly wish, in weighing what you have advanced on this head, to forget who speaks, and simply consider what is spoken. The person I greatly reverence and love ; the doctrine I utterly abhor, as I apprehend it to be totally subversive of the very essence of Christianity.

God himself hath declared, that in consequence of his justice, he will, in the great day of retribution, ‘render to every man according to his works, whether they be good or evil.’ But man says no. “There is no righteous wrath or vindictive justice in God.” (Spirit of Love, part II. p. 108.) If so, ye may go on, ye children of the Devil, in doing the works of your father. It is written indeed, ‘The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness.’ But this is not literally to be taken ; for, properly speaking, there is no such thing as the ‘wrath of God !’

Fear not the bug-bear of ‘everlasting burnings.’ There is not only no *everlasting* punishment, but no punishment at all ; no such thing in the universe. It is a mere vulgar error !

I should be extremely glad to prophesy these smooth things too, did not a difficulty lie in the way. As nothing is more frequently or more expressly declared in Scripture, than God’s anger at sin, and his *punishing* it both temporally and eternally, every assertion of this kind strikes directly at the credit of the whole revelation. For if there be one falsehood in the Bible, there may be a thousand ; neither can it proceed from the God of truth. However, I will weigh all your assertions. And may the God of truth shine on both our hearts !

I must premise, that I have no objection to the using the words *wrath* (or *anger*) and *justice* as nearly synonymous ; seeing anger stands in the same relation to justice, as love does to mercy : love and anger being the passions (speaking after the manner of men) which correspond with the dispositions of mercy and justice. Whoever therefore denies God to be capable of wrath or anger, acts consistently in denying his justice also.

You begin, 1. “No wrath (anger, vindictive justice) ever was or ever will be in God.” (Spirit of Prayer, part I. p. 27.) If a wrath

of God were any where, it must be every where." So it is, as sure as the *just* God is every where.

2. "Wrath and pain dwell only in the creatures." (p. 28.) Pain is only in creatures. Of wrath we are to inquire farther.

3. "To say God ever punished any creature out of *wrath*, is as absurd as to say, he began the creation out of *wrath*." I conceive not. It is not *as absurd* to say, God is angry at the *guilty*, as to say God is angry at the *innocent*. Now it is certain, when God began the creation of man, no guilty men were in being.

4. "He must always will that to his creatures, which he willed at the creation of them." True. And he willed, at the very creation of men, 'to reward every one as his work should be.'

5. "God is incapable of willing pain to any creature, because he is nothing but goodness." (p. 29.) You mean, because his goodness excludes justice. Nay, that is the very question.

6. "God can give nothing but happiness from himself, because he hath nothing else in himself." (Spirit of Love, part I. p. 3.) As if you had said, "God can give nothing but infinity from himself, because he has nothing else in himself." It is certain he has not. He is all infinity. Yet the argument will not hold.

7. "God can no more begin to have any wrath after the creature is fallen, than he could be infinite wrath and rage from all eternity." (part II. p. 4.) No changing the terms. We have nothing to do with *rage*. This properly means excessive anger. Setting this aside, I answer to the argument, God was infinitely just from all eternity: in consequence of which his anger then began to show itself, when man had sinned.

8. "No wrath can be in God, unless God was from all eternity an infinity of wrath." (p. 6.) That is infinitely just. So he was and will be to all eternity.

9. "There must be either no possibility of wrath, or no possibility of its having any bounds." (p. 7.) The divine justice cannot possibly have any bounds. It is as unlimited as his power.

10. "Two things show the nature of wrath, a tempest and a raging sore. The former is wrath in the elements; the latter is wrath in the body. Now both these are a disorder. But there is no disorder in God. Therefore, there is no wrath in God." p. 13.

"A tempest is wrath in the elements; a raging sore is wrath in the body." It is not. Neither the body, the elements, or any thing inanimate is capable of wrath. And when we say, "The sore looks angry," does any one dream this is to be taken literally? The pillars of the argument therefore are rotten. Consequently the superstructure falls to the ground.

In vain would you prop it up by saying, "Wrath can have no other nature in the body than it has in spirit, because it can have no existence in body, but what it has from spirit." (p. 15.) Nay, it can have no existence in body at all, as yourself affirm presently after. Yet you strangely go on, "There is but one wrath in all outward things, animate or inanimate." Most true; for all wrath is in animals; things inanimate are utterly incapable of it.

“There can be but one kind of wrath, because nothing can be wrathful but spirit.” (p. 18.) Never then let us talk of wrathful elements, or wrathful tempests, or sores, again.

11. “Wrath and evil are but two words for the same thing.” (ibid.) This is home. But it cannot be granted without proof.

12. “God is as capable of wrath, as of thickness, hardness, and larkness; because wrath can exist no where else but in thickness, hardness, and darkness.” (p. 71.) So far from it, that wrath cannot exist in thickness or hardness at all. For these are qualities of bodies: and “nothing can be wrathful but spirit.”

13. “Wrath cannot be in any creature, till it has lost its first perfection.” (p. 72.) That remains to be proved.

Thus far you have advanced arguments for your doctrine. You next attempt to answer objections. And to the objection, that Scripture speaks so frequently of the wrath of God, you answer,

1. “All the wrath and vengeance that ever were in any creature, is to be called and looked on as the wrath and vengeance of God.” I totally deny that proposition, and call for the proof of it.

2. “God works every thing in nature. Therefore all death, or rage, or curse, whatever it is, must be said, in the language of Scripture, to be the wrath or vengeance of God.” (p. 55.) I deny the consequence. The latter proposition does not follow from the former. And indeed it is not true. All death, and rage, and curse, is not in the language of Scripture termed the wrath and vengeance of God.

3. “Because the devils have their life from God; therefore their cursed, miserable, wrathful life, is said to be the curse, and misery, and wrath of God upon them.” (p. 53.) Neither can this be proved, that the devils having their life from God, is the reason why they are said to be under his wrath. Nor does the Scripture ever term their wrathful miserable life, the wrath or misery of God.

4. “Devils are his, as well as holy angels: Therefore all the wrath and rage of the one must be as truly his wrath and rage burning in them, as the joy of the others is his joy.” (p. 54.) So it seems, “The wrath of God” in Scripture means no more or less than “the wrath of the Devil!” However this argument will not prove it. The joy of saints (not of angels that I remember) is styled, The joy of their Lord, because he prepared it for them and bestows it on them. Does he prepare and bestow the rage of devils upon them.

5. “His wrath and his vengeance are no more in God, than what the psalmist calls *his ice and his frost*.” (p. 74.) There is nothing parallel in the case. We cannot take the latter expressions literally, without glaring absurdity: the former we may.

6. “The earth trembled because he was wroth. No wrath here but in the elements.” Nay, if so, here was no wrath at all. For we are agreed, “Only spirits can be wrathful.”

7. One more text, usually cited against your opinion, you improve into an argument for it. ‘Avenge not yourselves, for ven-

geance is mine.' "This is a full proof that the vengeance is not in God. If it was, then it would belong to every child of God, or he could not 'be perfect as his Father is perfect.' (p. 76.) Yes, he could, in all his imitable perfections. But God has peculiarly forbidden our imitating him in this. 'Vengeance,' says he, 'is mine,' incomunicably mine; unless so far as he delegates it to those who are in authority. This therefore clearly shows, that God executes vengeance, though justice, not vengeance, is properly in him.

Having now proved (as you suppose) that God has neither anger nor justice, it remains only to show, (which indeed follows by easy and natural consequence) that he never did, nor can punish.

"To say Adam's miserable state was a punishment inflicted upon him by God, is an utter absurdity. (Spirit of Prayer, part I. p. 24.) His sin had not the least punishment of any kind inflicted upon it by God." (p. 26.) This is flat and plain. But let us see how far this account agrees with that which God himself hath given.

'Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat: in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' (Gen. ii. 17.) 'And the serpent said unto the woman, ye shall not die.' (ch. iii. 4.) 'And the woman, being deceived, did eat.' (1 Tim. ii. 14.) 'and gave unto her husband and he did eat.' (Gen. iii. 6.) 'And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed—Dust thou shalt eat all the days of thy life.' (ver. 14.) 'And I will put enmity between thee and the woman.' ver. 15.

'Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and (that is, in) thy conception.' (ver. 16.) 'And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast eaten of the tree, cursed is the ground for thy sake: in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.' (ver. 17.) 'Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,' ver. 19.

Can any man read this and affirm, "God did not inflict the least punishment of any kind, either on Eve or Adam, or the serpent?" With what eyes or understanding then must he read?

But you say, "All that came on Adam was implied in what he chose to himself." (p. 25.) It was. He chose it to himself in the same sense, that he who robs chooses to be hanged. But this does not at all prove, that the death which one or the other suffers is no punishment.

You go on. "Fire and brimstone, or manna, rained on the earth, are only one and the same love." (Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 72.) "It was the same love that preserved Noah, burnt up Sodom, and overwhelmed Pharaoh in the Red Sea." (p. 68.) Surely nothing can equal this, unless you add, (which indeed you must do, to be consistent with yourself,) "It is one and the same love which will say, 'Come ye blessed,' and 'Depart ye cursed, into everlasting fire.'"

You add, "'whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.' Here you have God's own word for it, nothing but love chasteneth." (p. 81.) We know his love chasteneth his children. Of these only God is speaking here, appears from the latter clause of the sentence. And

yet we cannot say even as to them, It is nothing but his love. It is mercy mixed with justice.

You cite one text more: 'I have smitten you: yet have ye not returned to me,' (Amos iv. 9:) and say, "Now how is it possible for words to give stronger proof?" (ibid.) Proof of what! Not that God did not punish them: but that 'in the midst of wrath he remembered mercy.'

To these texts of Scripture, (wide enough of the point,) you subjoin, "The doctrine of atonement made by Christ is the strongest demonstration, that the wrath to be atoned, cannot be in God." (p. 85.) Who talks of "wrath to be atoned?" "The wrath to be atoned" is neither sense nor English; though it is a solecism you perpetually run into: (I hope not on purpose to puzzle the cause:) that the sin to be atoned cannot be in God we all allow; but it does not affect the question.

Once more, to silence all contradiction at once, to stop the mouths of all gainsayers, you say, "This (that there is no *anger*, no vindictive *justice* in God, no *punishment* at all inflicted by him,) is openly asserted, constantly affirmed and repeated in the plainest letter of Scripture." Whether this, or the very reverse is true, will appear, from a few out of numberless texts, which I shall barely set down, without any comment, and leave to your cool consideration.

You say, I. There is no vindictive, avenging, or punitive *justice* in God. II. There is no *wrath* or *anger* in God. III. God inflicts no *punishment* on any creature, neither in this world, nor that to come.

God says,

I. 'The *just* Lord is in the midst of you.' (Zeph. iii. 5.) 'Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne.' (Psalm lxxxix. 14.) 'Wilt thou condemn him that is most *just*?' (Job xxxiv. 17.) 'He is excellent in power and in plenty of *justice*.' (Job xxxvii. 13.) 'Just and true are thy ways, O King of saints.' (Rev. xv. 3.) Thou art *just* in all that is brought upon us.' (Neh. ix. 33.) 'There is no God beside me, a *just* God and a Saviour.' Isaiah xlvi. 21. 'Whom God hath sent forth, that he might be *just* and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.' (Rom. iii. 25, 26.)

II. 'The Lord heard their words and was *wroth*.' (Deut. i. 34.) 'The Lord was *wroth* with me for your sakes.' (Chap. iii. 26.) 'I was *wroth* with my people.' (Isa. xlvi. 6.) 'For his covetousness I was *wroth*.' (Chap. lvii. 17.) 'And the *anger* of the Lord was kindled against Israel.' (Num. xxv. 8.) 'His *wrath* is against them that forsake him.' (Ezra viii. 22.) 'Thou art very *wroth* with us.' (Lam. v. 20.) 'Thou art *wroth*, for we have sinned.' (Isa. lxiv. 5.) 'Who may stand in thy sight, when thou art *angry*?' (Psalm xxiv. 7) 'I have mingled my drink with weeping, because of thine *indignation*, and thy *wrath*.' (Psalm cii. 9, 10.) 'In my *wrath* I smote thee.' (Isa. lx. 10.) 'He hath visited in his *anger*.' (Job xxxv. 15.) 'God distributeth sorrow in his *anger*.' (Ch. xxii. 17.) 'I have seen affliction by the rod of his *wrath*.' (Lam. iii. 1.) 'I swear

in my *wrath*, they shall not enter into my rest.' (Psalm xcv. 11.) 'He casteth upon them the fierceness of his *anger*, *wrath*, and *indignation*—He made a way to his *anger*, he spared not their soul from death.' (Psalm lxxviii. 49, 50.) 'At his *wrath* the earth shall tremble.' (Jer. x. 10.) 'The land is desolate because of his *anger*. (Ch. xxv. 35.) 'By his *anger* they are consumed.' (Job iv. 9.) 'The Lord shall swallow them up in his *wrath*, and the fire shall devour them.' (Psalm xxi. 9.) 'The Lord turned not from his *wrath*.' (2 Kings xxiii. 26.) 'For all this his *anger* is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still.' (Isa. v. 25.) 'The Lord is slow to *anger*, and of great kindness: he will not always chide, neither kóepeth he his *anger* for ever.' (Psalm ciii. 8, 9.) 'The Lord turned from the fierceness of his *anger*.' (Josh. vii. 26.) 'In *wrath* remember mercy.' (Hab. iii. 2.) 'Though thou wast *angry*, thine *anger* is turned away' (Isa. xii. 1.) 'Many a time turned he his *anger* away.' (Psalm lxxvii. 38.)

III. 'I will *punish* the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity.' (Isa. xiii. 11.) 'Behold the Lord cometh to *punish* the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity.' (Chr. xxvi. 21.) 'Is not destruction to the wicked, and a strange *punishment* to the workers of iniquity?' (Job xxxi. 3.) 'I will *punish* you according to the fruit of your doings.' (Jer. xxi. 14.) 'I will *punish* you for all your iniquities.' (Amos iii. 2.) 'If ye will not hearken unto me, then I will *punish* you seven times more for your sins.' (Lev. xxvi. 18.) 'I will *punish* all that oppress them.' (Isa. xxx. 20.)

Now, which am I to believe, God or man?

Your miserable philosophy leads you, in the third place, totally to deny the Scripture doctrine of justification. Indeed you do not appear to have the least conception of the matter: no, not even to know what the term *justification* means. Accordingly you affirm,

1. "Salvation (which as all divines agree, includes both justification and sanctification) is nothing else but to be made like Christ." (Sp. of Pr. P. I. p. 53.) 2. "Regeneration is the whole of man's salvation." (P. II. p. 37.) 3. "Redemption is nothing else but the life of God in the soul." (P. I. p. 79.) 4. "The one only work of Christ as your Redeemer is, to raise into life the smothered spark of heaven in you." (Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 45.) 5. "He is our atonement and reconciliation with God, because by him we are set again in our first state of holiness." (P. II. p. 86.) 6. "The atonement of the divine wrath or justice," (a mere solecism, on which your whole reasoning for several pages is built) "and the extinguishing of sin in the creature, are only different expressions of the same thing." (p. 106.) (Nay the former is an expression of nothing: it is flat nonsense.) 7. "All that Christ does as an atonement, has no other operation but that of renewing the fallen nature of man." (p. 21.)

Here are seven peremptory assertions. But till they are fully proved, I cannot give up my Bible.

But you grow bolder and bolder; and say, "The satisfaction of Christ is represented in all our systems of divinity, as a satisfaction

made to God, and the sufferings and death of Christ, as that which could only avail with God to have mercy on man. Nay, what is still worse, if possible, the ground, and nature, and efficacy of this great transaction between God and man, is often explained by debtor and creditor: man as having contracted a debt with God, which he could not pay, and God as having a right to insist upon the payment of it." (p. 106.) "There is no wrath in God, no fictitious atonement, no folly of debtor and creditor." (p. 131.) "What is still worse if possible! Folly of debtor and creditor!" Surely I would not have spoken thus, unless I had been above the Son of God.

'After this manner pray ye, Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.' (Matt. vi. 9, 12.) 'And Jesus said, There was a certain creditor which had two debtors.' (Luke vii. 41.) 'The kingdom of heaven is likened to a king who would take account of his servants. And one was brought unto him who owed him ten thousand talents. But for as much as he had not to pay, his Lord commanded him to be sold and all that he had. The servant fell down, saying, Lord, have patience with me. And his lord was moved with compassion, and forgave him the debt.' Yet afterwards on his unmercifulness to his fellow-servant, he retracted that forgiveness; and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do unto you also, if ye from your heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.' Matt. xviii. 23, &c.

Is not a man here represented "as having contracted a debt with God, which he cannot pay?" And God "as having" nevertheless "a right to insist upon the payment of it?" And a right, 'if he hath not to pay, of delivering him to the tormentors? And is it not expressly asserted, that God will, in some cases, claim this right, and use it to the uttermost? Upon whom then lights this imputation of folly, and of what is still worse? 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge!' 'Forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

But if the Son of God did not die to atone for our sins, what did he die for?

Your answer, "He died, 1. To extinguish our own hell within us." (Sp. of Pr. P. II. p. 159.) Nay, the Scripture represents this, not as the first, but the second end of his death.

"2. To show that he was above the world, death, hell, and Satan." (p. 130; 131.) Where is it written, that he died for this end? Could he not have done this without dying at all?

"3. His death was the only possible way of overcoming all the evil that was in fallen man." (p. 129.) This is true, supposing that he atoned for our sins. But if this supposition be not made, his death was not the only possible way whereby the Almighty could have overcome all things.

"4. Through this he got power to give the same victory to all his brethren of the human race." (p. 132.) Had he not this power before? Otherwise, how was he *αὐτός*, 'He that is; God over all; blessed for ever?' If Christ died for no other ends than these, what need was there of his being more than a creature?

As you seem never to have employed your thoughts on justification or redemption, in the Scripture sense, I beg leave to subjoin a plain account thereof, written by a woman of the last century.

1. *‘Christ hath acquired for us a right to eternal life by his satisfaction and merits alone. Neither our repentance nor amendment, can be any satisfaction for sin. It is only ‘through his blood that we have redemption.’ (Eph. i. 7.) This alone ‘cleanseth us from all sin.’ (1 John i. 7.) And herein ‘was the love of God manifested towards us, that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.’ (1 John iv. 9, 10.) So was the ‘Lord our righteousness,’ (Jer. xxiii. 6;) without which we could not have been justified. As man owed his Creator the perfect obedience of his whole life, or a punishment proportioned to his transgression, it was impossible he could satisfy him, by a partial and imperfect obedience. Neither could he merit any thing from him, to whom he owed all things. There was need, therefore, of a Mediator, who could repair the immense wrong he had done to the Divine Majesty satisfy the Supreme Judge, who had pronounced the sentence of death against the transgressors of his law, suffer in the place of his people, and merit for them pardon, holiness, and glory. Accordingly he ‘gave himself a ransom for all.’ (1 Tim. ii. 6;) and, ‘by himself purged our sins.’ (Heb. i. 3.) ‘He loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God.’ (Eph. v. 2.) So we read, ‘God raised him from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification:’ because our Surety’s being discharged, by the will and act of the Judge himself, is a full proof that he has paid our whole debt.

2. ‘Nor is there any more sure way to the imitation of Christ, than faith in Christ crucified, in him ‘who suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we might tread in his steps:’ ‘who died for us, while we were yet enemies, that we might be justified by his blood.’ (Rom. v. 9.) Yet it is true this doctrine finds no place in those who are proud of heart, who love their own reasonings, and have no taste for ‘the sincere milk of the word.’ But it is precious to them who feel the weight of their sins, who know they ‘are by nature children of wrath,’ and at the same time utterly incapable either of paying the debt, of rising from the death of sin, of conquering themselves, the world, and the Devil, or of meriting eternal life.

3. ‘The origin and cause of our redemption is, the ineffable love of God the Father, who willed to redeem us by the blood of his own Son: the grace of the Son, who freely took our curse upon him, and imparts his blessing and merits to us. And the Holy Spirit who communicates the love of the Father, and the grace of the Son to our hearts.

‘When we speak of this, and of the satisfaction of Christ, we speak of the inmost mystery of the Christian faith. Therefore all

the inventions of men ought now to be kept at the utmost distance ; nor can any thing certain be established, without the express authority of Scripture. And herein is offered first to our consideration, the only begotten Son of God, as the head of the redeemed, the righteous servant of God, who by the ‘knowledge’ of himself ‘shall justify many.’ (Isa. lii. 11.) Him God hath constituted the ‘Surety of that better Covenant,’ (Heb. vii. 22,) the covenant of grace. And how clearly is his execution of this office described in the fifty third chapter of Isaiah ? Where the prophet describes him as ‘bearing our griefs,’ or sins, ‘and carrying our sorrows,’ (ver. 4.) ‘All we,’ says he, ‘like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way ; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.’ (ver. 6.) All mankind have forsaken God, and placed their own will upon his throne, and so were liable to the highest punishment, when the Mediator voluntarily interposed himself between them and the just Judge. And the incomprehensible love of God that he might spare them, ‘spared not his own Son.’ This is shown in those words, ‘The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.’ It was on this account that ‘he was oppressed and afflicted ; and brought as a lamb to the slaughter,’ (ver. 7) while God ‘made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.’ (2 Cor. v. 21.) This is expressed in the 9th and 10th verses.—‘He had done no violence, nor was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him,’ when he ‘made his soul an offering for sin.’ How exactly do his own words agree with these ! ‘I am the good Shepherd, and I lay down my life for the sheep.’ (John x. 14, 15.) For them ‘was he taken from prison and from judgment, and cut off out of the land of the living.’ (ver. 8.) How doth God herein ‘commend his love towards us, in delivering up his own Son to die for us ?’ Yea, God ‘was pleased with bruising him,’ when clothed with our flesh, and bearing our sins, he manifested to angels and men his infinite love of divine justice, till being ‘made obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,’ he satisfied its utmost demand.

‘It was then ‘God was pleased to bruise him,’ when ‘he made his soul an offering for sin.’ He then appeared before the Judge of all, under ‘the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin,’ as the apostle speaks. And, therefore, God was pleased ‘to condemn sin in the flesh,’ (Rom. viii. 3, 4,) to ‘bruise him’ who sustained the person of sinners. But this was only the prelude of a glorious victory. Therefore the prophet adds, ‘He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.’ (ver. 10.) After repeating (ver. 11,) the sum of all, ‘He shall bear their iniquities,’ he subjoins the cause of his reward, (ver. 12,) ‘Because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors : for he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.’

‘The fifth verse, of which I have not yet spoken, renders this great truth still more evident. ‘He was wounded for our trans-

gressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed.' He loved his own body less than his mystical body the church, and therefore gave the former for the latter, 'to redeem and purchase it with his own blood,' by paying himself as a ransom for it. Hereby 'nailing the handwriting which was against us to the cross, he took it out of the way,' and so became 'our peace.'

4. 'From all which it appears, that Christ was not only a pattern, but first and principally the surety of the new covenant, yea, a sacrifice and a victim, for the sins of his people : 'whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood.' (Rom. iii. 25.) And that precious sacrifice offered on the cross, is the very centre and marrow of the gospel. To that 'one offering' whereby our great High Priest 'hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,' (Heb. x. 14,) all the ancient sacrifices referred, as well as numberless other types and figures. 'All these,' says the apostle, 'were shadows of things to come, but the body is Christ.' (Col. ii. 17.) He it was, who 'not by the blood of bulls and goats, but by his own blood, entered into the holiest, having obtained eternal redemption for us.' (Heb. ix. 12.) In consequence of this we are accepted, 'through the offering of the body of Christ once for all.' (chap. x. 10.) In all the ancient types and figures 'without shedding of blood there was no remission : ' which intended to show, there never could be any without the blood of the great Antitype : without that grand propitiatory sacrifice, which (like the figure of it) was to be offered 'without the gate.'

'Indeed the whole worship of the Old Testament teaches nothing else but the satisfaction made by the blood of Christ, and our reconciliation with God thereby : hence he is styled 'The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world ;' with a view to the paschal lamb, and the other lambs that were offered in sacrifice : on which account the inhabitants of heaven likewise 'give glory and sing a new song, because he hath redeemed them unto God by his blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.' Rev. v. 9.

5. 'To this might be added the numerous figures that occur in the lives of the old patriarchs, prophets, and kings. But it may suffice to add to the preceding only two testimonies more of the manner of our redemption by a proper sacrifice : the one that of St. Paul, Christ 'hath delivered us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us ; as it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' Gal. iii. 1. The other of St. Peter, 'Who himself bore our sins, in his own body on the tree.' (1 Pet. ii. 24.) From all this abundantly appears the substitution of the Messiah in the place of his people, thereby atoning for their sins, and restoring them to the favour of God.

'These are the points which are so vehemently opposed by Socinus and his followers ; who rob Christ of the principal part of his priestly office, and leave him only that of interceding for us by

prayer: as if any intercession were worthy of Christ, who had not his full satisfaction and propitiatory sacrifice for its foundation. Indeed these cannot be put asunder, as sufficiently appears from the words cited before, 'He bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors:' where the Holy Ghost closely joins his intercession, with his satisfaction made by sacrifice. These and a thousand other solid arguments that might be advanced in proof of this fundamental doctrine, overturn all the cavils that flow from corrupt *reason*, which, indeed, are weak and thin as a spider's web.'

I have dwelt the longer on this head, because of its inexpressible moment. For whether or not the doctrine of *justification by faith* be, as all Protestants thought at the time of the reformation, *Articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiae*, a doctrine without which there can be no Christian church: most certainly there can be none where the whole notion of justification is ridiculed and exploded: unless it be such a church as includes, according to your account, every child of man: of which consequently Turks, Deists, and Pagans, are as real members, as the most pious Christian under the sun. I cannot but observe, that this is the very essence of Deism; no serious Infidel need contend for more. I would therefore no more set one of this opinion to convert Deists, than I would set a Turk to convert Mahometans.

As every one that is justified is *born of God*, I am naturally led to consider, in the next place, (so far as it is delivered in the tracts now before me,) your doctrine of *the new-birth*.

"In the day that Adam ate of the tree he died: that is, his heavenly spirit, with its heavenly body, were extinguished. To make that heavenly spirit and body to be alive again in man, this is regeneration." (Sp. of Prayer, P. I. p. 9.) O no; this is not; nor any thing like it. This is the unscriptural dream of Behmen's heated imagination.

"See the true reason why only the Son of God could be our Redeemer. It is because he alone could be able to bring to life again that celestial spirit and body which had died in Adam." (ibid.) Not so: but he alone could be our Redeemer, because he alone, 'by that one oblation of himself once offered, could make a sufficient sacrifice and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.'

"See also why a man must 'be born again of water and of the Spirit.' He must be born again of the Spirit, because Adam's heavenly spirit was lost." (ibid.) Nay, but because Adam had lost the inward image of God, wherein he was created. And no less than the Almighty Spirit of God could renew that image in his soul.

"He must be born of water, because that heavenly body which Adam lost was formed out of the heavenly materiality, which is called water." (ibid.) Vain philosophy! The plain meaning of the expression, 'Except a man be born of water,' is neither more nor less than this, 'Except he be baptized.' And the plain reason why he ought to be thus born of water is, because God hath appointed it. He hath appointed it as an outward and visible sign of an inward

and spiritual grace : which grace is, ‘a death unto sin, and a new-birth unto righteousness.’

“The necessity of our regaining our first heavenly body is the necessity,” (I presume you mean the ground of the necessity,) “of our eating the body and blood of Christ.” (p. 10.) Neither can I believe this, till I find it in the Bible. I am there taught to believe, that our ‘spiritually receiving the body and blood of Christ,’ which is most eminently done in the Lord’s Supper, is necessary to ‘strengthen and refresh our souls, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.’

“The necessity of having again our first heavenly spirit is shown, by the necessity of our being baptized with the Holy Ghost.” (ibid.) No. That we ‘must be baptized with the Holy Ghost,’ implies this and no more, that we cannot be ‘renewed in righteousness and true holiness,’ any otherwise than by being overshadowed, quickened, and animated by that blessed Spirit.

“Our fall is nothing else but the falling of our soul from its heavenly body and spirit, into a bestial body and spirit. Our redemption,” (you mean, our new-birth) “is nothing else but the regaining our first angelic spirit and body.” (ibid.) What an account is here of the Christian redemption! How would Dr. Tindal have smiled at this! Where you say redemption is nothing else but the life of God in the soul, you allow an essential part of it. But here, you allow it to be nothing else but that which is no part of it at all : nothing else but a whim, a madman’s dream, a chimera, a mere non-entity!

“This” (angelic spirit and body) “in Scripture is called our new or inward man.” (ibid.) The inward man, in Scripture means one thing, the new man another. The former means ‘the mind opposed to the body :’ ‘though our outward man,’ our body, ‘perish, yet the inward man,’ the mind or soul, ‘is renewed day by day.’ (2 Cor. iv. 16.) The latter means universal holiness : ‘put off the old man which is corrupt ; and put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.’ (Eph. iv. 22—24.) But neither does the one nor the other ever mean this angelic spirit and body.

You yourself know better what the new-birth is. You describe it better, though still with amazing queerness of language, where you say, “Man hath the light and water of an outward nature to quench the wrath of his own life, and the light and meekness of Christ, as a seed born in him, to bring forth anew the image of God.”

But it is not strange, that you speak so confusedly and darkly, as you generally do, of the New-Birth, seeing you seem to have no conception of that faith whereby we are born again. This abundantly appears from your frank declaration, “We are neither saved by faith nor by works.” (Part II. p. 36.) • Flatly contrary to the declaration of St. Paul, ‘By grace we are saved through faith.’

To put the matter out of dispute, you declare that you mean by

faith, "a desire to be one with Christ." (P. I. p. 50.) Again. "The desire of turning to God is the coming of Christ into the soul. This faith will save thee." (p. 76.) So in your judgment, saving faith is "a desire of coming to God, or of being one with Christ." I know the contrary from experience. I had this desire many years before I even knew what saving faith was.

Faith is so far from being only this desire, that it is no desire at all. It differs from all desire *toto genere*, although doubtless all good desires accompany it. It is, according to St. Paul, an *εἰσχος*, an *evidence* or *conviction*, (which is totally different from a *desire*,) of *things not seen*: a supernatural, a divine *evidence* and *conviction* of the things which God hath revealed in his word; of this in particular, that the Son of God hath loved *me*, and given himself for *me*. Whosoever hath this faith is born of God. Whosoever thus believeth is saved; and if he endure therein 'to the end,' shall be saved everlastingly.

The process of this work in the soul, of the present salvation which is through faith, you likewise describe confusedly and obscurely. The sum of what you say is this: "The painful sense of what you are, kindled into a working state of sensibility by the light of God, is the light and fire from whence the spirit of prayer proceeds. In its first kindling nothing is found but pain, wrath, and darkness. And, therefore, its first prayer is all humility." (P. II. p. 172.)

Would it not be more intelligible, if one had said, 'The convincing Spirit of God, gives you to see and feel, that you are a poor, undone, guilty, helpless sinner. At the same time, he incites you to cry for help to him who is mighty to save.' This is true. But it is not true, that in the first kindling of this fire, in plain terms, during the first convictions, "nothing is found but pain, wrath, and darkness." Very often there are found even in the first conviction, sweet gleams of light, touches of joy, of hope, and of love, mixed with sorrow and fear. Much less is it true, that the first prayer of an awakened sinner is all humility. (ibid.) On the contrary, a sinner newly awakened, has always more or less confidence in himself, in what he is, or has, or does, and will do: which is not humility, but downright pride. And this mingles itself with all his prayer, till the day-star is just rising in his heart.

You add, "This prayer is met by the divine love, and changed into hymns, and songs, and thanksgivings." (ibid.) It is so, when 'being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' "The state of fervour melts away all earthly passions and affections, and leaves no inclination in the soul, but to delight in God alone." (ibid.) It is certain, this is the genuine effect of 'the love of God shed abroad in the heart:' which expression of St. Paul, I suppose, means the same with this state of fervour. "Then its prayer changes again, and continually stands in fulness of faith, and purity of love, in absolute resignation, to do and be what and how his Beloved pleaseth. This is the last state of the

spirit of prayer, and is our highest union with God, in this life." (p. 173.)

Assuredly it is: fulness of faith, 'beholding with open face the glory of the Lord,' purity of love, free from all mixture of its contrary, yielding the whole heart to God; absolute resignation, excluding every degree of self-will, sacrificing every thought, word, and work to God. But do we change directly, from our first love, into the highest union with God? Surely not: There is an intermediate state between that of babes in Christ, and that of fathers. You yourself are very sensible there is; although you here speak as if there were not.

You go on. "People who have long dwelt in this fervour are frightened when coldness seizes upon them." (p. 174.) That is, when they lose it, when their love grows cold. And certainly, well they may, if this fervour was to bring them to "fulness of faith, purity of love, and absolute resignation." Well may they be affrighted, if that fervour be lost, before "it has done its work."

Indeed they might be affrighted, when it is not lost, if that which follows be true. "Fervour is good and ought to be loved; but distress and coldness are better." (p. 176.) "It brings the soul nearer to God, than the fervour did." (p. 175.) The fervour, you said, "brought the soul to its highest union with God in this life." Can coldness do more? Can it bring us to an union, higher than the highest?

To explain this, you say, "The fervour made the soul delight in God. But it was too much an own delight. It was a fancied self-holiness, and occasioned rest and satisfaction in itself, in a spiritual self." (ibid.) Either fervour does bring us to purity of love, and absolute resignation, or not. To say it does not, contradicts what you said but now. And if it does, we cannot say, "Coldness does the work which fervour did, in an higher degree."

I should not insist so long on these glaring inconsistencies, were not the doctrine you are here labouring to support, absolutely inconsistent with that of St. Paul; and naturally productive of the most fatal consequences. St. Paul asserts, the present 'kingdom of God' in the soul 'is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' He continually teaches, that these which God hath joined, man ought not to put asunder: that peace and joy should never be separated from righteousness, being the divine means both of preserving and increasing it, and that we may, yea, ought to 'rejoice evermore,' till 'the God of peace sanctifies us wholly.' But if these things are so, then "Distress and coldness are not better" than fervent love and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Again. The doctrine, that it is better and more profitable for the soul, to lose its sense of the love of God than to keep it, is not only unscriptural, but naturally attended with the most fatal consequences. It directly tends to obstruct, if not destroy the work of God in the heart, by causing men to bless themselves in those ways, which damp the fervour of their affections; and to imagine they are con-

siderably advanced in grace, when they have grieved, yea, quenched the Spirit. Nay, but let all who now feel the love of God in their hearts, and ‘walk in the light, as he is in the light,’ labour by every possible mean to ‘keep themselves in the love of God.’ Let them be ever ‘fervent in spirit.’ Let them ‘rejoice evermore,’ and stir up the gift of God, which is in them. And if at any time, “Coldness seizes upon them,” let them be assured, they have ‘grieved the Spirit of God.’ Let them be affrighted: let them fear lest they sink lower and lower: yea, into total deadness and hardness of heart. At the peril of their souls, let them not rest in darkness, but examine themselves, search out their spirits, cry vehemently to God, and not cease, till he restores the light of his countenance.

5. If this doctrine of the unprofitableness of *coldness* above *fervor*; directly tends to make believers easy, while they are sliding back into unbelief, you have another which tends as directly to make them easy who never believed at all, I mean, that of *Christ in every man*. What you advanced on this head, I desire next to consider, as the importance of it requires.

“The birth of Christ is already begun in every one. Jesus is already within thee, (whoever thou art,) living, stirring, calling, knocking at the door of thy heart.” (Spirit of Prayer, part I. p. 55.) “Every one has Christ in his spirit, lying there as in a state of insensibility and death.” (Spirit of Love, part II. p. 34.) But he is living for all that. And though “in a state of insensibility,” he is “stirring, calling, knocking at the door of the heart!”

“Something of heaven” (you use this phrase as equivalent with Christ) “lies in every soul in a state of inactivity and death.” (p. 35.) “All the holy nature, tempers, and Spirit of Christ, lie hid as a seed in thy soul.” (Spirit of Prayer, part I. p. 68.) But are they active or inactive? *Living and stirring*, or in a state of *insensibility and death*?

“Thou art poor, and blind, and naked, and miserable, while all the peace and joy of God are within thee.” (p. 74.) This is most wonderful of all! Are these within him who is dead in sin? Who is a “stranger to all that is holy and heavenly?” If they are, how can he be miserable, who has “all the peace and joy of God within him?” Will you say, “They are in him, but he does not feel them?” Nay, then they are not in him. I have peace in me, no longer than I feel peace. I feel joy, or I have it not.

“See here the extent of the Catholic church of Christ! It takes in all the world.” (p. 56.) So Jews, Mahometans, Deists, Heathens, are all members of the church of Christ! Should we not add devils too? Seeing these also are to dwell with us in heaven!

“Poor sinner, Christ dwelleth in the centre, the fund, or bottom of thy soul.” (p. 59.) What is this? What is either the *centre*, the *top*, or *bottom* of a spirit?

“When Adam fell, this centre of his soul became a prisoner in an earthly animal. But from the moment God spoke Christ into Adam, all the treasures of the divine nature, the light and Spirit

of God came again into man, into the centre of his soul." (p. 60.) I cannot find in the Bible when that was; when God spoke Christ into Adam.

We come now to the proofs of these strong assertions.

And, 1. "No faith could ever begin, unless every man had Christ in him." (Spirit of Love, part II. p. 34.) This proposition needs just as much proof itself, as that which it is brought to prove.

2. "Unless the remains of the perfect love of God were in every man, it would be impossible he should ever love God at all." (p. 38.) Why so? Cannot God give his love this moment to one who never loved him before?

3. "Unless Christ was hidden in the soul, there could not be the least beginning of man's salvation. For what could begin to desire heaven, unless something of heaven were hid in the soul?" What could? Why any soul, which had nothing but hell in it before the moment grace was infused from above.

4. "The ten commandments lay hid in men's souls," (how?) "till called into sensibility by writing them on stone. Just so Christ lies in the soul, till awakened by the mediatorial office of the Holy Jesus." (p. 35.) This is only assertion still, not proof. But what do you mean by the *mediatorial* office of Christ? And how is "Christ awakened by the mediatorial office of the Holy Jesus?"

5. "The sea cannot be moved by any other wind than that which had its birth from the sea itself." (p. 40.) I think, it can. I have seen it "moved by a wind, which had its birth from the land."

6. "The musician cannot make his instrument give any other melody than that which lies hid in it, as its own inward state." (p. 42.) Did the tune then lie hid in the trumpet, before the trumpeter blew? And was this tune, or another, or all that ever were and will be played on it, the *inward state* of the trumpet?

"No more can the mind have any grief or joy, but that which is from itself." (p. 43.) An unhappy comparison! For the instrument can have no melody or sound at all *from itself*: and most unhappily applied to the operations of God upon the souls of men. For has God no more power over my soul, than I have over a musical instrument?

These are your arguments to prove that Christ is in every man; a blessing which St. Paul thought was peculiar to believers. He said, 'Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates, (unbelievers.) You say, Christ is *in you*, whether ye be reprobates or not. 'If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his,' saith the Apostle. Yea, but "every man," saith Mr. Law, "hath the Spirit of God. The Spirit of Christ is in every soul." (Spirit of Prayer, P. I. p. 63.) 'He that hath not the Son of God hath not life,' saith St. John. But Mr. Law saith, "Every man hath the Son of God." Sleep on then, ye Sons of Belial, and take your rest: ye are all safe: for 'he that hath the Son hath life.'

There can hardly be any doctrine under heaven more agreeable to flesh and blood: nor any which more directly tends, to prevent

the very dawn of conviction, or at least to hinder its deepening in the soul, and coming to a sound issue. None more naturally tends to keep men asleep in sin, and to lull asleep those who begin to be awakened. Only persuade one of this, "Christ is already in thy heart; thou hast now the inspiration of his Spirit: all the peace and joy of God are within thee, yea, all the holy nature, tempers, and Spirit of Christ :" and you need do no more: the syren song quiets all his sorrow and fear. As soon as you have sewed this pillow to his soul, he sinks back into the sleep of death.

VI. But you have made an ample amends for this, by providing so short and easy a way to heaven; not a long, narrow, troublesome, round-about path, like that described in the Bible: but one that will as compendiously save the soul, as Dr. Ward's *pill and drop* heal the body: a way so plain, that they who follow it need no Bible, no human teaching, no outward means whatever; being every one able to stand alone: every one sufficient for himself!

"The first step is, To turn wholly from yourself, and to give up yourself wholly unto God." (P. II. p. 22.) If it be, no flesh living shall be saved. How grievously do we stumble at the threshold! Do you seriously call this, *The first step?* "To turn wholly from myself, and give up myself wholly unto God?" Am I then to step first on the highest round of the ladder? Not unless you turn it upside down. The way to heaven would be short indeed, if the first and the last step were all one: if we were to step as far the moment we set out, as we can do till we enter into glory.

But what do you mean by *giving up myself* to God? You answer, "Every sincere wish and desire after Christian virtues, is giving up yourself to him, and the very perfection of faith." Spirit of Love, P. II. p. 217.

Far, very far from it; I know from the experience of a thousand persons, as well as from Scripture, and the very reason of the thing, that a man may have sincere desires after all these, long before he attains them. He may sincerely wish, to give himself up to God, long before he is able so to do. He may desire this, not only before he has the perfection, but before he has any degree of saving faith.

More marvellous still is that which follows, "You may easily and immediately, by the mere turning of your mind, have all these virtues, patience, meekness, humility, and resignation to God." (p. 212. Who *may*? Not I. Not you. Not any that is born of a woman: as is proved by the daily experience of all, that know what patience, meekness, or resignation means.

But how shall I know whether I have faith or not? "I will give you an infallible touchstone. Retire from all conversation only for a month. Neither write, nor read, nor debate any thing with yourself. Stop all the former workings of your heart and mind, and stand all this month in prayer to God. If your heart cannot give itself up in this manner to prayer, be fully assured you are an Infidel. Spirit of Prayer, P. II. p. 163.

If this be so, the Infidels are a goodly company ! If every man be of that number, who cannot “stop all the former workings of his heart and mind, and stand thus in prayer to God for a month together.”

But I would gladly know, by what authority you give us this touchstone ? And how you prove it to be infallible ? I read nothing like it in the oracles of God. I cannot find one word there of “refraining from all conversation, from writing and reading for a month.” (I fear, you make no exception, in favour of public worship, or reading the word of God.) Where does the Bible speak of this ? Of “stopping for a month, or a day, all the former workings of my heart and mind ?” Of refraining from all converse with the children of God, and from reading his word ? It would be no wonder should any man make this unscriptural (if not anti-scriptural) experiment, if Satan were permitted to work in him ‘a strong delusion,’ so that he should ‘believe a lie.’

Nearly related to this touchstone is the direction which you give elsewhere. “Stop all self-activity ; be retired, silent, passive, and humbly attentive to the inward light.” P. I. p. 77. 82.

But beware ‘the light which is in thee be not darkness ;’ as it surely is, if it agree not with ‘the law and the testimony.’ “Open thy heart to all its impressions,”—If they agree with that truly infallible touchstone. Otherwise regard no impression of any kind, at the peril of thy soul—“wholly stopping the workings of thy own reason and judgment.” I find no such advice in the word of God. And I fear they who stop the workings of their reason, lie the more open to the workings of their imagination.

There is abundantly greater danger of this when we fancy we have no longer need to “be taught of man.” To this your late writings directly lead. One who admires them will be very apt to cry out, “I have found all that I need know of God, of Christ, of myself, of heaven, of sin, of grace, and of salvation.” (P. II. p. 4.) And the rather, because you yourself affirm roundly, “when once we apprehend the all of God, and our own nothingness,” (which a man may persuade himself he does, in less than four and twenty hours,) “it brings a kind of infallibility into the soul in which it dwells : all that is vain, and false, and deceitful, is forced to vanish and flee before it.” (P. I. p. 95.) Agreeably to which you tell your convert, “You have no questions to ask of any body.” (Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 218.) “And if, notwithstanding this, he will ask, “But how am I to keep up the flame of love ?” You answer, “I wonder you should want to know this. Does a blind, or sick, or lame man want to know, how he should desire sight, health, or limbs ?” (Spirit of Prayer, p. 165.) No ; but he wants to know, how he should attain, and how he should keep them. And he who has attained the love of God, may still want to know how he shall keep it. And he may still inquire, “May I not take my own passions, or the suggestions of evil spirits for the workings of the Spirit of God ?” (p. 198.) To this you answer, “Every man knows, when he is governed by the

spirit of wrath, envy, or covetousness, as easily and as certainly as he knows when he is hungry." (ibid.) Indeed he does not ; neither as *easily* nor as *certainly*. Without great care, he may take wrath to be pious zeal, envy to be virtuous emulation ; and covetousness to be Christian prudence, or laudable frugality. " Now the knowledge of the Spirit of God in yourself is as perceptible as covetousness." Perhaps so ; for this is as difficultly perceptible as any temper of the human soul.—" And liable to no more delusion." Indeed it need not ; for this is liable to ten thousand delusions.

You add, " His Spirit is more distinguishable from all other spirits, than any of your natural affections are from one another." (p. 199.) Suppose joy and grief. Is it more distinguishable from all other spirits, than these are from one another ? Did any man ever mistake grief for joy ? No, not from the beginning of the world. But did none ever mistake nature for grace ? Who will be so hardy as to affirm this ?

But you set your pupii as much above the being taught by books, as the being taught by men. " Seek, say you, for help no other way, neither from men, nor books, but wholly leave yourself to God." Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 225.

But how can a man " leave himself wholly to God," in the total neglect of his ordinances ? The old Bible way is, to " leave ourselves wholly to God," in the constant use of all the means he hath ordained. And I cannot yet think the new is better, though you are fully persuaded it is. " There are two ways, you say, of attaining goodness and virtue ; the one by books or the ministry of men, the other by an inward birth. The former is only in order to the latter." This is most true, that all the externals of religion, are in order to the renewal of our souls in righteousness and true holiness. But it is not true, that the external way is one, and the internal way another. There is but one scriptural way, wherein we receive inward grace, through the outward means which God hath appointed.

Some might think that when you advised, " Not to seek help from books," you did not include the Bible. But you clear up this, where you answer the objection, of your not esteeming the Bible enough. You say, " How could you more magnify John the Baptist, than by going from his teaching, to be taught by that Christ, to whom he directed you ? Now the Bible can have no other office or power, than to direct you to Christ. How then can you more magnify the Bible than by going from its teaching, to be taught by Christ ?" So you set Christ and the Bible in flat opposition to each other ! And is this the way we are to learn of him ? Nay, but we are taught of him, not by going from the Bible, but by keeping close to it. Both by the Bible and by experience we know, that his word and his Spirit act in connexion with each other. And thus it is, that by Christ continually teaching and strengthening him through the Scripture, " The man of God is made perfect, and thoroughly furnished for every good word and work."

According to your veneration for the Bible, is your regard for pub-

lic worship and for the Lord's Supper, 'Christ, you say, is the church or temple of God within thee. There the Supper of the Lamb is kept. When thou art well grounded in this inward worship, thou wilt have learned to live unto God above time and place. For every day will be Sunday to thee; and wherever thou goest, thou wilt have a priest, a church, and an altar along with thee.' Spirit of Prayer, P. I. p. 73.

The plain inference is, thou wilt not need to make any difference between Sunday and other days. Thou wilt need no other church than that which thou hast always along with thee; no other Supper, worship, priest, or altar. Be well grounded in this inward worship, and it supersedes all the rest. This is right pleasing to flesh and blood, and I could most easily believe it, if I did not believe the Bible. But that teaches me inwardly to worship God, as at all times, and in all places, so particularly on his own day, in the congregation of his people, at his altar, and by the ministry of those his servants whom he hath given for this *very* thing, 'for the perfecting of the saints,' and with whom he will be 'to the end of the world.'

Extremely dangerous therefore is this other gospel, which leads quite wide of the gospel of Christ. And what must the consequence be, if we thus break, yea, and teach men so, not one only, neither the least of his commandments? Even that we shall be called the *least* in the kingdom of heaven.' God grant this may not fall on you or me!

7. However, whether we have a place in heaven or not, you are very sure we shall have none in hell. For there is no hell in *rerum natura*; no such place in the universe. You declare this over and over again, in a great variety of expressions. It may suffice to mention two or three. "Hell is no penalty prepared or inflicted by God. (Spirit of Prayer, P. II. p. 33.) Damnation is only that which springs up within you. (Spirit of Love, P. II. p. 47.) Hell and damnation are nothing but the various operations of self." (Sp. of Prayer, P. I. p. 79.)

I rather incline to the account published a few years ago, by a wise and pious man, (the late bishop of Cork,) where he is speaking of the improvement of human knowledge by revelation. Some of his words are, 'Concerning future punishments, we learn from revelation only, 1. That they are both for soul and body, which are distinguished in Scripture by 'the worm that dieth not, and the fire which never shall be quenched:' and accordingly we are bid to 'fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.' (Procedure, &c. of Human Understanding.) Upon which I shall only remark, that whereas we find by experience, the body and soul in this life are not capable of suffering the extremity of pain and anguish at the same time, insomuch that the greatest anguish of mind is lost and diverted by acute and pungent pain of body: yet we learn from Scripture, 'that in hell the wicked will be subject to extreme torments of both together.' (p. 150.)

2. 'That the chief cause of their eternal misery will be, an

eternal exclusion from the beatific vision of God. This exclusion seems to be the only punishment to which we can now conceive a pure spirit liable. And according as all intelligent beings are at a less or greater distance from this fountain of all happiness, so they are necessarily more or less miserable or happy.

3. That one part of those punishments will be by fire, than which we have not any revelation more express and positive. And as it is an instance of great goodness in God, that the joys of heaven are represented to us, under figurative images of light, and glory, and a kingdom, and that the substance shall exceed the utmost of our conceptions: so it is an argument of his strict justice, that future punishments are more literally threatened and foretold.

4. 'The Eternity of these punishments is revealed as plainly as words can express it. And the difficulty of that question, "What proportion endless torments can bear to momentary sins," is quite removed by considering, that the punishments denounced are not sanctions entirely arbitrary, but are withal so many previous warnings or declarations of the natural tendency of sin itself. So that an unrepenting sinner must be miserable in another life by a necessity of nature. Therefore he is not capable of mercy; since there never can be an alteration of his condition, without such a change of the whole man, as would put the natural and settled order of the creation out of course.'

Doubtless this eminent man (whose books on the *Human Understanding*, and on *Divine Analogy*, I would earnestly recommend to all who either in whole or in part deny the Christian Revelation,) grounded his judgment both of the nature and duration of future punishments on these and the like passages of Scripture.

'If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.' 'He that despised Moses's law died without mercy: of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God?' 'For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' Heb. x. 26—31.

And let not any, who live and die in their sins, vainly hope to escape his vengeance. 'For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment'—'The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.' (2 Pet. ii. 4—9.) In that day, peculiarly styled 'The Day of the Lord, they that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake: some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt.' (Dan. xii. 2.) Among the latter will all those be found, who are now by their obstinate impenitence, 'treasuring up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God: who will then render 'indignation and wrath, tribulation

and anguish upon every soul of man that doth evil.' (Rom. ii. 5—9.) He hath declared the very sentence which he will then pronounce on all the workers of iniquity, 'Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.' (Matt. xxv. 41.) And in that hour it will be executed: being 'cast into outward darkness, where is wailing and gnashing of teeth,' (ver. 30.) they 'will be punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.' (2 Thess. i. 9.) A punishment not only without end, but likewise without intermission. For when once 'they are cast into that furnace of fire,' that 'lake of fire burning with brimstone, the worm' gnawing their soul 'dieth not, and the fire' tormenting their body 'is not quenched.' So that 'they have no rest day or night; but the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever.'

Now thus much cannot be denied, that these texts speak *as if* there were really such a place as hell, *as if* there were a real fire there, and *as if* it would remain for ever. I would then ask but one plain question. If the case is not so, why did God speak *as if* it was? Say you, "To affright men from sin?" What, by guile? By dissimulation? By hanging out false colours? Can you possibly ascribe this to the God of truth? Can you believe it of him? Can you conceive the Most High dressing up a scare-crow, as we do to fright children? Far be it from him. If there be then any such fraud in the Bible, the Bible is not of God. And, indeed, this must be the result of all: if there be *no unquenchable fire, no everlasting burnings*, there is no dependence on those writings, wherein they are so expressly asserted, nor on the *eternity* of heaven, any more than of hell. So that if we give up the one, we must give up the other. No hell, no heaven, no revelation!

In vain you strive to supply the place of this, by putting *purgatory* in its room; by saying, "These virtues must have their perfect work in you, if not before, yet certainly *after death*, (Sp. of Love, P. II. p. 232.) Every thing else must be taken from you by fire, either here or hereafter." (ibid.) Poor, broken reed! Nothing will "be taken from you" by that fire which is 'prepared for the Devil and his angels,' but all rest, all joy, all comfort, all hope. For 'the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'

I have now, Sir, delivered my own soul. And I have used great plainness of speech; such as I could not have prevailed on myself to use to one whom I so much respect, on any other occasion.

O that your latter works may be more and greater than your first! Surely they would, if you could ever be persuaded to study, instead of the writings of Tauler and Behmen, those of St. Paul, James, Peter, and John; to spew out of your mouth and out of your heart that *vain philosophy*, and speak neither higher nor lower things, neither more nor less than the *Oracles of God*: to renounce, despise, abhor all the high flown bombast, all the unintelligible jargon of the mystics, and come back to the plain religion of the Bible, *We love him because he first loved us.*

LONDON, Jan. 6. 1756.

A LETTER
TO THE
REV. MR. TOOGOOD,
OF EXETER;
OCCASIONED BY HIS
DISSENT FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FULLY
JUSTIFIED.

SIR,

IF you fairly represent Mr. White's arguments, they are liable to much exception. But whether they are or not, your answers to them are far from unexceptionable. To the manner of the whole I object; you are not serious: you do not write as did those excellent men, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Howe, Dr. Calamy, who seem always to speak not laughing but weeping. To the matter I object, That if your argument hold, as it is proposed in your very titlepage, if "a dissent from our church be the genuine consequence of the allegiance due to Christ," then all who do not dissent, have renounced that allegiance, and are in a state of damnation!

I have not leisure to consider all that you advance, in proof of this severe sentence. I can only at present examine your main argument, which indeed contains the strength of your cause. "My separation from the Church of *England*," you say, "is a debt I owe to God, and an act of allegiance due to Christ, the only Lawgiver in the church." p. 2.

Again, "The controversy turns upon *one single point*, Has the church *power to decree rites and ceremonies*? If it has this power, then all the objections of the Dissenters, about kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and the like are impertinent; if it has no power at all of this kind, yea, if Christ the great Lawgiver and King of the church, hath expressly commanded, that no power of this kind shall ever be *claimed* or ever be *yielded* by any of his followers: then the dissenters will have honour before God for protesting against such usurpation." p. 3.

I join issue on this single point: "If Christ hath expressly commanded, that no power of this kind shall ever be *claimed*, or ever *yielded* by any of his followers?" Then are all who yield it, all churchmen, in a state of damnation, as much as those who 'deny

the Lord that bought them.' But if Christ hath not expressly commanded this, we may go to church, and yet not go to hell.

To the point then. The power I speak of is, a power of *decreeing rites and ceremonies*, of appointing such circumstantial (suppose) of public worship as are in themselves purely indifferent, being no way determined in Scripture.

And the question is, "Hath Christ expressly commanded, that this power shall never be *claimed*, nor ever *yielded* by any of his followers?" This I deny. How do you prove it?

Why thus. "If the Church of England has this power, so has the Church of Rome." (p. 4.) Allowed. But this is not to the purpose. I want "the *express command* of Christ."

You say, "Secondly, The persons who have this power in England, are not the clergy, but the parliament." (p. 8, 9.) Perhaps so. But this also strikes wide. Where is the "express command of Christ?"

You ask, "Thirdly, How came the civil magistrate by this power?" (p. 11.) Christ commands us to 'call no man on earth father and master,' that is, to acknowledge no authority of any in matters of religion." (p. 12.) At length we are come to the express command, which, according to *your* interpretation, is express enough: "That is, acknowledge no authority of *any* in matters of religion:" own no power in *any* to appoint any circumstances of public worship, any thing pertaining to decency and order. But this interpretation is not allowed. It is the very point in question.

We allow, Christ does here expressly command to acknowledge no such authority of any, as the Jews paid their Rabbies, whom they usually styled, either *fathers* or *masters*: implicitly believing all they affirmed, and obeying all they enjoined. But we deny, that he expressly commands, to acknowledge no authority of governors, in things purely indifferent, whether they relate to the worship of God, or other matters.

You attempt to prove it by the following words, 'One is your Master' and Lawgiver, even Christ: 'and all ye are brethren;' (Matt. xxiii. 8, 9;) "all Christians; having no dominion over one another." True: no such dominion as their Rabbies claimed: but in all things indifferent, Christian Magistrates have dominion. As to your inserting, *and Lawgiver*, in the preceding clause, you have no authority from the text: for it is not plain, that our Lord is here speaking of himself in that capacity. *Διδασκαλος*, the word here rendered *master*, you well know, conveys no such idea. It should rather have been translated, *teacher*. And indeed the whole text primarily relates to doctrines.

But you cite another text: 'The princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them: but it shall not be so among you.' (Matt. xx. 25.) Very good: that is, Christian pastors, shall not exercise such dominion over their flocks, as Heathen princes do over their subjects. Most sure: but without any violation of this, they may appoint how things shall be done decently and in order.

“ But Christ is the sole Lawgiver, Judge, and Sovereign in his church.” (p. 12.) He is, the sole *Sovereign, Judge, and Lawgiver*. But it does not follow (what you continually infer) that there are no *subordinate judges* therein: nor, that there are none who have power, to make regulations therein in subordination to him. King George is sovereign, judge, and lawgiver, in these realms. But are there no subordinate judges? Nay, are there not many who have power to make rules or laws in their own little communities? And how does this “ invade his authority and throne?” Not at all; unless they contradict the laws of his kingdom.

“ However, he alone has authority to fix the terms of communion for his followers or church. (ibid.) And the terms he has fixed no men on earth have authority to set aside or alter.” This I allow (although it is another question) none has authority to exclude from the church of Christ, those who comply with the terms which Christ has fixed. But, not to admit into the society called *The Church of England*, or, not to administer the Lord’s Supper to them, is not the same thing with “ excluding men from the church of Christ:” unless this society be *The whole church of Christ*, which neither you nor I will affirm. This society therefore may scruple to receive those as members, who do not observe her rules in things indifferent, without pretending “ to set aside or alter the terms which Christ has fixed” for admission into the Christian church: and yet without “ lording it over God’s heritage, or usurping Christ’s throne.” Nor does all “the allegiance we owe him,” at all hinder our obeying them that have the rule over us, in things of a purely indifferent nature. Rather, our allegiance to *him*, requires our obedience to *them*. In being “their servants” thus far we are “Christ’s servants.” We obey his *general* command, by obeying our governors in *particular* instances.

Hitherto you have produced no express command of Christ to the contrary. Nor do you attempt to show any such, but strike off from the question for the twelve or fourteen pages following. But after these you say, (p. 26,) The subjects of Christ are expressly commanded to receive nothing as parts of religion, which are *only commandments of men.*” (Matt. xv. 9.) We grant it: but this is not a command, not to ‘obey those who have the rule over us.’ And we must obey them in things indifferent, or not at all. For in things which God hath forbidden, should such be enjoined, we dare not obey. Nor need they enjoin what God hath commanded.

Upon the whole we agree, that Christ is the only *supreme Judge and Lawgiver* in the church: I may add, and in the world: for ‘there is no power,’ no secular power, but of God: of God who ‘was manifested in the flesh, who is over all, blessed for ever.’ But we do not at all agree in the inference which you would draw therefrom, namely, that there is no *subordinate judge or lawgiver* in the church. You may just as well infer, That there is no subordinate judge or lawgiver in the *world*. Yea there is, both in the one and the other.

And in obeying these *subordinate powers*, we do not, as you aver, renounce the *supreme*: no, but we obey them for *his* sake.

We believe, it is not only innocent, but our bounden duty so to do: in all things of an indifferent nature to 'submit ourselves to every ordinance of man,' and that for the Lord's sake: because we think, he has not forbidden, but expressly commanded it. Therefore "as a genuine fruit of our allegiance to Christ," we 'submit,' both 'to the king and governors sent by him,' so far as possibly we can, without breaking some plain command of God. And you have not yet brought any plain command, to justify that assertion that "we may not submit either to the king; or to governors sent by him, in any circumstances relating to the worship of God."

Here is a plain declaration, 'There is no power but of God; the powers that exist are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power,' (without an absolute necessity, which in things indifferent there is not,) 'resisteth the ordinance of God.' And here is a plain command grounded thereon: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers.' Now by what Scripture does it appear, That we are not to be *subject* in any thing pertaining to the worship of God? This is an exception which we cannot possibly allow, without clear warrant from Holy Writ. And we apprehend, those of the Church of Rome alone, can decently plead for such an exception. It does not sound well in the mouth of a Protestant, to claim an exemption from the jurisdiction of the civil powers, in all matters of religion, and in the minutest circumstance relating to the church.

Another plain command is that mentioned but now: 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake.' And this we shall think ourselves hereby fully authorized to do, in things of a religious as well as a civil nature, till you can produce plain, explicit proof from Scripture, that we must submit in the latter, but not in the former. We cannot find any such distinction in the Bible; and till we find it there, we cannot receive it. But must believe our allegiance to Christ requires submission to our governors in *all things* indifferent.

This I speak, even on supposition, that the things in question were enjoined merely by the king and parliament. If they were, what then? Then I would 'submit to them for the Lord's sake.' So that in *all* your parade, either with regard to king George or queen Anne, there may be *wit*, but no *wisdom*: no force, no argument, till you can support this distinction, from plain testimony of Scripture.

Till this is done, it can never be proved, that "a dissent from the Church of England (whether it can be justified from other topics or not) is the genuine and just consequence, of the allegiance which is due to Christ, as the only Lawgiver in the church." As you proposed to "bring the controversy to this short and plain issue, to let it turn on this single point:" I have done so: I have spoke to this alone; although I could have said something on many other points,

which you have advanced as points of the utmost certainty, although they are far more easily affirmed than proved. But I waive them for the present : hoping this may suffice, to show any fair and candid inquirer, That it is very possible to be united to Christ and to the Church of England at the same time : that we need not separate from the church, in order to preserve our allegiance to Christ ; but may be firm members thereof, and yet 'have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.'

I am, Sir,

Your very humble Servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

BRISTOL, Jan. 10, 1758.

A TREATISE ON BAPTISM.

CONCERNING BAPTISM I shall inquire, *What* it is : What benefits we receive by it : Whether our Saviour designed it to remain *always* in his church : And who are the proper *subjects* of it ?

1. *What it is.* It is the initiatory sacrament, which enters us into covenant with God. It was instituted by Christ, who alone has power to institute a proper sacrament, a sign, seal, pledge, and means of grace, perpetually obligatory on all Christians. We know not indeed the exact time of its institution ; but we know it was long before our Lord's Ascension. And it was instituted in the room of circumcision. For as that was a sign and seal of God's covenant, so is this.

2. *The matter* of this sacrament is water ; which as it has a natural power of cleansing, is the more fit for this symbolical use. Baptism is performed by *washing*, *dipping*, or *sprinkling* the person, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is hereby devoted to the ever blessed Trinity. I say by *washing*, *dipping*, or *sprinkling* ; because it is not determined in Scripture, in which of these ways it shall be done, neither by any express precept, nor by any such example as clearly proves it ; nor by the force or meaning of the word *baptize*.

3. *That there is no express precept* all calm men allow. Neither is there any conclusive example. John's baptism in some things agreed with Christ's, in others differed from it. But it cannot be certainly proved from Scripture, that even John's was performed by dipping. It is true, he baptized *in* Enon, *near* Salim, 'where there was much water.' But this might refer to breadth rather than depth ; since a narrow place would not have been sufficient for so great a multitude. Nor can it be proved, that the baptism of our

Saviour, or that administered by his disciples was by immersion. No, nor that of the eunuch baptized by Philip; though ‘they both went down to the water:’ for that *going down* may relate to the chariot, and implies no determinate depth of water. It might be up to their knees, it might not be above their ankles.

4. And as nothing can be determined from Scripture precept or example, so neither from the force or meaning of the word. For the words baptize and baptism do not necessarily imply *dipping*, but are used in other senses in several places. Thus we read, that the Jews ‘were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea,’ (1 Cor. x. 2.) but they were not *plunged* in either. They could, therefore, be only *sprinkled* by drops of the sea-water, and refreshing dews from the cloud: probably intimated in that, ‘Thou sentest a gracious rain upon thine inheritance, and refreshedest it when it was weary:’ (Psalm lxviii. 9.) Again, Christ said to his two disciples, ‘Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with:’ (Mark x. 38.) but neither he nor they were dipt, but only sprinkled or washed with their own blood. Again we read, Mark vii. 4. of *the baptisms*, (so it is in the original,) of pots and cups, and tables or beds. Now pots and cups are not necessarily dipped when they are washed. Nay, the Pharisees washed the outsides of them only. And as for tables or beds, none will suppose they could be dipped: here then the word baptism in its natural sense, is not taken for dipping, but for washing or cleansing. And, that this is the true meaning of the word baptize, is testified by the greatest scholars and most proper judges in this matter. It is true, we read of being ‘buried with Christ in baptism.’ But nothing can be inferred from such a figurative expression. Nay, if it held exactly, it would make as much for sprinkling as for plunging: since in burying, the body is not plunged through the substance of the earth, but rather earth is *poured* or *sprinkled* upon it.

5. And as there is no clear proof of dipping in Scripture, so there is very probable proof of the contrary. It is highly probable, the apostles themselves baptized great numbers, not by dipping, but by washing, sprinkling, or pouring water. This clearly represented the cleansing from sin, which is figured by baptism. And the quantity of water used was not material: no more than the quantity of bread and wine in the Lord’s supper. The jailer, ‘and all his house were baptized in the prison: Cornelius with his friends, (and so several households,) at home. Now is it likely, that all these had ponds or rivers, in or near their houses, sufficient to plunge them all? Every unprejudiced person must allow, the contrary is far more probable. Again, three thousand at one time and five thousand at another, were converted and baptized by St. Peter at Jerusalem; where they had none but the gentle waters of Siloam, according to the observation of Mr. Fuller, “There were no water-mills in Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive them.” The place, therefore, as well as the number, makes it highly probable that all these were baptized by sprinkling, or pouring, and not by immersion.

To sum up all, the manner of baptizing (whether by dipping or sprinkling) is not determined in Scripture. There is no command for one rather than the other. There is no example from which we can conclude for dipping rather than sprinkling. There are probable examples of both; and both are equally contained in the natural meaning of the word.

II. 1. What are the *Benefits* we receive by Baptism is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is, the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death. That we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin, and that all sin deserves eternal misery, was the unanimous sense of the ancient church, as it is expressed in the ninth article of our own. And the Scripture plainly asserts, that we were 'shapen in iniquity, and in sin did our mother conceive us. That we were all by nature children of wrath, and dead in trespasses and sins:' that 'in Adam all died:' that 'by one man's disobedience all were made sinners:' that 'by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin: which came upon all men; because all had sinned.' This plainly includes infants; for they too *die*: therefore, *they have sinned*. But not by actual sin: therefore, by original: else what need have they of the death of Christ? Yea, 'Death reigned from Adam to Moses even over those who had not sinned' (actually) 'according to the similitude of Adam's transgression.' This, which can relate to infants only, is a clear proof that the whole race of mankind are obnoxious both to the guilt and punishment of Adam's transgression. But 'as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free-gift came upon all men, to justification of life. And in virtue of this free-gift, the merits of Christ's life and death, are applied to us in baptism. 'He gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word:' (Eph. v. 25, 26.) namely, in baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this our church prays in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be 'washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing:' and declares in the rubric at the end of the office, 'It is certain, by God's word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved.' And this is agreeable to the unanimous judgment of all the ancient fathers.

2. By baptism we enter into covenant with God; into that everlasting covenant, which he hath commanded for ever. (Psal. cix. 11.) That new covenant, which he promised to make with the spiritual Israel; even to 'give them a new heart and a new spirit, to sprinkle clean water upon them,' (of which the baptismal is only a figure) 'and to remember their sins and iniquities no more:' in a word, 'to be their God,' as he promised to Abraham, in the evangelical covenant, which he made with him, and all his spiritual offspring. (Gen. xvii. 7, 8.) And as circumcision was then the way of entering into

this covenant, so baptism is now: which is therefore styled by the apostle, (so many good interpreters render his words,) The *stipulation, contract, or covenant* of a good conscience with God.

3. By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ, its head. The Jews were admitted into the church by circumcision, so are the Christians by baptism. For ‘as many as are baptized into Christ,’ in his name, ‘have’ thereby ‘put on Christ.’ (Gal. iii. 27.) That is, are mystically *united to* Christ, and made *one* with him. For ‘by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body.’ (1 Cor. xii. 13.) Namely, ‘the church, the body of Christ.’ (Eph. iv. 12.) From which spiritual, vital union with him, proceeds the influence of his grace on those that are baptized; as from our union with the church, a share in all its privileges, and in all the promises Christ has made to it.

4. By baptism we who were ‘by nature children of wrath,’ are made the children of God. And this regeneration, which our church in so many places ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith: being ‘grafted into the body of Christ’s church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.’ This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, John iii. 5, ‘Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ By water, then, as a mean, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the apostle, ‘The washing of regeneration.’ Our church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism, than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God, by long-continued wickedness.

5. In consequence of our being made children of God, we are heirs of the kingdom of heaven. ‘If children,’ (as the apostle observes) ‘then heirs, heirs with God, and joint-heirs with Christ.’ Herein we receive a title to, and an earnest of, ‘a kingdom which cannot be moved.’ ‘Baptism doth now save us,’ if we live answerable thereto, if we repent, believe, and obey the gospel. Supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, so into glory hereafter.

III. 1. But did our Saviour design this should remain *always* in his church? This is the third thing we are to consider. And this may be despatched in few words, since there can be no reasonable doubt but it was intended to last as long as the church into which it is the appointed means of entering. In the *ordinary* way, there is no other means of entering into the church or into heaven.

2. In all ages the outward baptism is a *means* of the *inward*; as outward circumcision was, of the circumcision of the heart. Nor would it have availed a Jew to say, I have the inward circumcision, and therefore do not need the outward too: that soul was to be cut off from his people. He had despised, he had broken God’s everlasting covenant, by despising the seal of it. (Gen. xvii. 14.) Now

the seal of circumcision was to last among the Jews as long as the law lasted, to which it obliged them. By plain parity of reason, baptism, which came in its room, must last among Christians as long as the gospel covenant into which it admits, and whereunto it obliges all nations.

3. This appears also from the original commission which our Lord gave to his apostles, ‘ Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them’—‘ And, lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world.’ Now as long as this commission lasted, as long as Christ promised to be with them in the execution of it, so long doubtless were they to execute it, and to baptize as well as to teach. But Christ hath promised to be with them, that is by his Spirit, in their successors, to the end of the world. So long therefore without dispute, it was his design, that baptism should remain in his church.

IV 1. But the grand question is, Who are the proper subjects of baptism ? Grown persons only, or infants also ? In order to answer this fully, I shall, first, lay down the grounds of infant-baptism, taken from Scripture, reason, and primitive, universal practice ; and, secondly, answer the objections against it.

2. As to the grounds of it ; if infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism : seeing in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved, that this original stain cleaves to every child of man ; and that hereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation. It is true, the Second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first. But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed : through baptism in particular, which is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose : and to which God hath *tied us*, though he may not have tied *himself*. Indeed where it cannot be had, the case is different : but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule. This, therefore, is our first ground : infants need to be washed from original sin : therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.

3. Secondly, If infants are capable of making a covenant, and were and still are under the evangelical covenant, then they have a right to baptism, which is the entering seal thereof. But infants are capable of making a covenant, and were and still are under the evangelical covenant.

The custom of nations and common reason of mankind, prove that infants may enter into a covenant, and may be obliged by compacts made by others in their names, and receive advantage by them. But we have stronger proof than this, even God’s own word, (Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12,) ‘ Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord—your captains, with all the men of Israel ; your little ones, your wives, and the stranger—that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God.’ Now God would never have made a covenant with little ones, if they had not been capable of it. It is not

said *children* only, but *little children*, the Hebrew word properly signifying infants. And these may be still, as they were of old, obliged to perform in after-time, what they are not capable of performing at the time of their entering into that obligation.

4. The infants of believers, the true children of faithful Abraham, always were under the gospel covenant. They were included in it, they had a right to it, and to the seal of it: as an infant heir has a right to his estate, though he cannot yet have actual possession. The covenant with Abraham was a gospel covenant, the condition the same, namely, faith: which the apostle observes was 'imputed unto him for righteousness.' The inseparable fruit of this faith was obedience; for by faith he left his country, and offered his son. The benefits were the same; for God promised, 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee:' and he can promise no more to any creature; for this includes all blessings, temporal and eternal. The Mediator is the same; for it was in *his seed*, that is, in *Christ*, (Gen. xxii. 18. Gal. iii. 16.) that all nations were to be blessed: on which very account the apostle says, 'The gospel was preached unto Abraham.' (Gal. iii. 8.) Now the same promise that was made to him, the same covenant that was made with him, was made 'with his children after him.' (Gen. xvii. 7. Gal. iii. 7.) And upon that account it is called 'an everlasting covenant.' In this covenant children were also obliged to what they knew not, to the same faith and obedience with Abraham. And so they are still: as they are still equally entitled to all the benefits and promises of it.

5. Circumcision was then the seal of the covenant; which is itself therefore figuratively termed, *The Covenant*. (Acts vii. 8.) Hereby the children of those who professed the true religion, were then admitted into it, and obliged to the conditions of it, and 'when the law was added,' to the observance of that also. And when the old seal of circumcision was taken off, this of baptism was added in its room: our Lord appointing one positive institution to succeed another. A new seal was set to Abraham's covenant: the seals differed, but the deed was the same; only that part was struck off which was political or ceremonial. That baptism came in the room of circumcision, appears as well from the clear reason of the thing, as from the apostle's argument, where, after circumcision, he mentions baptism, as that wherein God had 'forgiven us our trespasses:' to which he adds, the 'blotting out the handwriting of ordinances,' plainly relating to circumcision and other Jewish rites; which as fairly implies, that baptism came in the room of circumcision, as our Saviour's styling the other sacrament, the *passover*, (Col. ii. 11, 12. 13. Luke xxii. 15.) shows that it was instituted in the place of it. Nor is it any proof that baptism did not succeed circumcision, because it differs in some circumstances, any more than it proves the Lord's supper did not succeed the *passover*, because in several circumstances it differs from it. This then is a second ground. Infants are capable of entering into covenant with God. As they a¹

ways were, so they still are under the evangelical covenant. Therefore they have a right to baptism, which is now the entering seal thereof.

6. Thirdly, If infants ought to *come to Christ*, if they are capable of admission into the church of God, and consequently of solemn, sacramental dedication to him, then they are proper subjects of baptism. But infants are capable of coming to Christ, of admission into the church, and solemn dedication to God.

That infants ought to *come to Christ* appears from his own words. 'They brought little children to Christ, and the disciples rebuked them. And Jesus said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' (Matt. xix. 13, 14.) St. Luke expresses it still more strongly, (chap. xviii. 15.) 'They brought unto him even infants, that he might touch them.' These children were so little, that they were brought to him. Yet he says, 'Suffer them to come unto me:' so little that 'he took them up in his arms;' yet he rebukes those who would have hindered their coming to him. And his command respected the future as well as the present. Therefore his disciples or ministers are still to suffer infants to come, that is to be brought unto Christ. But they cannot now come to him, unless by being brought into the church: which cannot be but by baptism. Yea, and 'of such,' says our Lord, 'is the kingdom of heaven;' not of such only, as were like these infants. For if they themselves were not fit to be subjects of that kingdom, how could others be so, because they were like them? Infants, therefore, are capable of being admitted into the church, and have a right thereto. Even under the Old Testament they were admitted into it by circumcision. And can we suppose they are in a worse condition under the gospel, than they were under the law? And that our Lord would take away any privileges which they then enjoyed? Would he not rather make additions to them? This then is a third ground. Infants ought to *come to Christ*, and no man ought to *forbid* them. They are capable of admission into the church of God. Therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.

7. Fourthly, If the apostles baptized infants, then are they proper subjects of baptism. But the apostles baptized infants, as is plain from the following consideration. The Jews constantly baptized as well as circumcised all infant-proselytes. Our Lord therefore commanded his apostles, to *proselyte* or *disciple* all nations by *baptizing* them, and not forbidding them to receive infants as well as others, they must needs baptize children also.

That the Jews admitted proselytes by baptism as well as by circumcision, even whole families together, parents and children, we have the unanimous testimony of their most ancient, learned, and authentic writers. The males they received by baptism and circumcision; the women by baptism only. Consequently the apostles, unless our Lord had expressly forbidden it, would of course do the same thing.

Indeed the consequence would hold from circumcision only. For

if it was the custom of the Jews, when they gathered proselytes out of all nations, to admit children into the church by circumcision, though they could not actually believe the law or obey it; then the apostles, making proselytes to Christianity by baptism, could never think of excluding children, whom the Jews always admitted (the reason for their admission being the same) unless our Lord had expressly forbidden it. It follows, the apostles baptized infants. Therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.

8. If it be objected, there is no express mention in Scripture of any infants whom the apostles baptized: I would ask, Suppose no mention had been made in *the Acts* of those two women baptized by the apostles, yet might we not fairly conclude, that when so many thousands, so many entire households were baptized, women were not excluded? Especially since it was the known custom of the Jews to baptize them? The same holds of children: Nay more strongly, on the account of circumcision. Three thousand were baptized by the apostles in one day, and five thousand in another. And can it be reasonably supposed, that there were no children among such vast numbers? Again, the apostles baptized many families: nay, we hardly read of one master of a family, who was converted and baptized, but his whole family, (as was before the custom among the Jews,) were baptized with him. Thus the 'jailer's household,' 'he and all his;' 'the household of Caius,' of 'Stephanus,' of 'Crispus.' And can we suppose, that in all these households, which, we read, were without exception baptized, there should not be so much as one child, or infant? But, to go one step further. St. Peter says to the multitude, *Acts* ii. 38, 'Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins. For the promise is to you and to your children.' Indeed the answer is made directly, to those who asked, 'What shall we do?' But it reaches farther than to those who asked the question. And though children could not actually repent, yet they might be baptized. And that they are included appears, 1. Because the apostle addresses himself to *every one* of them, and in *every one*, children must be contained. 2. They are expressly mentioned, 'The promise is to you and to your children.'

9. Lastly, If to baptize infants has been the general practice of the Christian church in all places and in all ages, then this must have been the practice of the apostles, and consequently the mind of Christ. But to baptize infants has been the general practice of the Christian church, in all places and in all ages. Of this we have unexceptionable witnesses. St. Austin for the Latin church, (who flourished before the year 400,) and Origen for the Greek, (born in the second century,) both declaring, not only that the whole church of Christ did then baptize infants, but likewise that they received this practice from the apostles themselves. (*August. de Genesi. Lib. 10. c. 23. Orig. in Rom. 6.*) St. Cyprian likewise is express for it, and a whole council with him (*Epis. ad Fidum.*) If need were we might cite likewise Athanasius, Chrysostom, and a cloud of

witnesses. Nor is there one instance to be found in all antiquity, of any orthodox Christian, who denied baptism to children when brought to be baptized: nor any one of the fathers, or ancient writers, for the first eight hundred years at least, who held it unlawful. And that it has been the practice of all regular churches ever since, is clear and manifest. Not only our own ancestors when first converted to Christianity, not only all the European churches, but the African too and the Asiatic, even those of St. Thomas in the Indies, do and ever did baptize their children. The fact being thus cleared, that infant-baptism has been the general practice of the Christian church in all places and in all ages, that it has continued without interruption in the church of God, for above seventeen hundred years, we may safely conclude, it was handed down from the apostles, who best knew the mind of Christ.

10. To sum up the evidence; if outward baptism be generally, in an ordinary way, necessary to salvation, and infants may be saved as well as adults, nor ought we to neglect any means of saving them: if our Lord commands such to *come*, to be *brought* unto him, and declares, ‘of such is the kingdom of heaven:’ if infants are capable of making a covenant, or having a covenant made for them by others, being included in Abraham’s covenant, (which was a covenant of faith, an evangelical covenant) and never excluded by Christ: if they have a right to be members of the church, and were accordingly members of the Jewish: if, suppose our Lord had designed to exclude them from baptism, he must have expressly forbidden his apostles to baptize them, (which none dares to affirm he did,) since otherwise they would do it of course, according to the universal practice of their nation: if it is highly probable they did so, even from the letter of Scripture, because they frequently baptized whole households, and it would be strange, if there were no children among them: if the whole church of Christ, for seventeen hundred years together baptized infants, and were never opposed till the last century but one, by some not very holy men in Germany: Lastly, if there are such inestimable benefits conferred in baptism, the washing away the guilt of original sin, the ingrafting us into Christ, by making us members of his church, and thereby giving us a right to all the blessings of the gospel: it follows, that infants may, yea, ought to be baptized, and that none ought to hinder them.

I am, in the last place, to answer those objections, which are commonly brought against infant-baptism.

1. The chief of these is: “Our Lord said to his apostles, (Matt. xxviii. 19,) ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’ Here Christ himself put *teaching* before *baptizing*. Therefore infants being incapable of being *taught*, are incapable of being *baptized*.”

I answer, 1. The order of words in Scripture, is no certain rule for the order of things. We read in St. Mark i. 4, ‘John baptized in the wilderness, and preached the baptism of repentance.’ And, ver. 5, ‘They were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins’

Now either the order of words in Scripture does not always imply the same order of things; or it follows, that John baptized before his hearers either confessed or repented. But, 2. The words are manifestly mistranslated. For if we read, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them—teaching them to observe all things, it makes plain tautology, vain and senseless repetition. It ought to be translated (which is the literal meaning of the words) *Go and make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them.* That infants are capable of being made proselytes or disciples, has been already proved. Therefore this text, rightly translated, is no valid objection against infant-baptism.

2. Their next objection is, "The Scripture says, 'Repent and be baptized'; 'Believe and be baptized.' Therefore repentance and faith ought to go before baptism. But infants are incapable of these. Therefore they are incapable of baptism."

I answer, repentance and faith were to go before circumcision, as well as before baptism. Therefore, if this argument held, it would prove just as well, that infants were incapable of circumcision. But we know God himself determined to the contrary, commanding them to be circumcised at eight days old. Now if infants were capable of being circumcised, notwithstanding that repentance and faith were to go before circumcision in grown persons, they are just as capable of being baptized, notwithstanding that repentance and faith are in grown persons to go before baptism. This objection, therefore, is of no force: for it is as strong against the circumcision of infants as infant-baptism.

3. It is objected, thirdly, "There is no command for it in Scripture. Now God was angry with his own people, because they did that, which he said, 'I commanded them not.' (Jer. vii. 31.) One plain text would end all the dispute."

I answer, 1. We have reason to fear it would not. It is as positively commanded in a very plain text of Scripture, that we should 'teach and admonish one another with psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing to the Lord with grace in our hearts,' (Eph. v. 14,) as it is to honour our father and mother. But does this put an end to all dispute? Do not these very persons absolutely refuse to do it, notwithstanding a plain text, an express command?

I answer, 2. They themselves practise what there is neither express command, nor clear example for in Scripture. They have no express command for baptizing women. They say indeed, "Women are implied in all nations." They are; and so are infants too: but the command is not express for either. And for admitting women to the Lord's Supper, they have neither express command nor clear example. Yet they do it continually, without either one or the other. And they are justified therein by the plain reason of the thing. This also justifies us in baptizing infants, though without express command or clear example.

If it be said, "But there is a command, (1 Cor. xi. 28,) 'Let a man. *avθεατος*, examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread':"

the word for *man* in the original signifying indifferently either men or women." I grant it does in other places ; but here the word *himself* immediately following, confines it to men only. " But women are implied in it, though not expressed." Certainly : and so are infants in all nations.

" But we have Scripture example for it: for it is said in the Acts, ' The apostles continued in prayer and supplication with the women.' " True, in prayer and supplication; but it is not said, in communicating. Nor have we one clear example of it in the Bible.

Since then they admit women to the communion, without any express command or example, but only by consequence from Scripture, they can never show reason why infants should not be admitted to baptism, when there are so many scriptures which by fair consequence show they have a right to it, and are capable of it.

As for the texts wherein God reproves his people for doing ' what he commanded them not : ' that phrase evidently means, what he had forbidden ; particularly in that passage of Jeremiah. The whole verse is, ' They have built the high places of Tophet, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not.' Now God had expressly forbidden them to do this ; and that on pain of death. But surely there is a difference between the Jews offering their sons and daughters to devils, and Christians offering theirs to God.

On the whole, therefore, it is not only lawful and innocent, but meet, right, and our bounden duty, in conformity to the uninterrupted practice of the whole church of Christ from the earliest ages, to consecrate our children to God by baptism, as the Jewish church were commanded to do by circumcision.

Nov. 11, 1756.

THE
DOCTRINE
OF
ORIGINAL SIN:
ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE, REASON, AND EXPERIENCE.

THE PREFACE.

1. A FEW years ago a friend put into my hand Dr. TAYLOR's "DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN," which I read carefully over and partly transcribed: and have many times since diligently considered. The Author is doubtless a person of sense, nay, of unusually strong understanding, joined with no small liveliness of imagination, and a good degree of various learning. He has likewise an admirable command of temper, so that he almost every where speaks as one in good humour. Add to this, that he has a smooth and pleasing, yet a manly and nervous style. And all these talents he exerts to the uttermost, on a favourite subject, in the treatise before us: which he has had leisure for many years, to revise, file, correct, and strengthen against all objections.

2. So finished a picce surely deserves the consideration of all those masters of reason which the age has produced. And I have long hoped, that some of those would attempt to show, how far the doctrine there laid down is true. And what weight there is, in the arguments which are produced, in confirmation of it. I know not how to believe, that all the clergy in England, are of the same opinion with this author. And certainly there are some whom all his skill in *Greek*, and even in *Hebrew*, does not make afraid. I should rejoice had any of these undertaken the task, who are in many respects better qualified for it; particularly in this, that they have time upon their hands; they have full leisure for such an em- ployment. But since *none else will, I cannot but speak, though lying under many peculiar disadvantages. I dare not be silent any longer: necessity is laid upon me, to provide those who desire to know the truth with some antidote against that deadly poison, which has been diffusing itself for several years, through our nation, our church, and even our universities. Nay, one (I hope, only one) father of the church has declared, "That he knows no book more

* Since the writing of this, I have seen several tracts, which I shall have occasion to take notice of hereafter. There are likewise many excellent remarks on this subject, in Mr. HERVEY'S Dialogues.

proper than this, *to settle the principles of a young clergyman.*" Is it not time then for *the very stones to cry out?*

3. For this is not a point of small importance ; a question that may be safely determined either way. On the contrary, it may be doubted whether the scheme before us, be not far more dangerous than open deism itself. It does not shock us like bare-faced infidelity : we feel no pain, and suspect no evil while it steals like "water into our bowels," like "oil into our bones." One who would be upon his guard in reading the works of Dr. Middleton or Lord Bolingbroke, is quite open and unguarded in reading the smooth, decent writings of Dr. Taylor : one who does not *oppose* (far be it from him !) but only *explain* the Scripture, who does not raise any difficulties or objections against the Christian revelation, but only *removes* those with which it had been unhappily encumbered for so many centuries !

4. I said, "Than *open* deism." For I cannot look on this scheme as any other than *old* deism in a *new* dress : seeing it saps the very foundation of all revealed religion, whether Jewish or Christian. "Indeed, my Lord, said an eminent man to a person of quality, I cannot see that we have much need of Jesus Christ." And who might not say, upon this supposition, "I cannot see that we have much need of Christianity." Nay, not any at all ; for "they that are whole, have no need of a physician ;" and the Christian revelation speaks of nothing else, but the great *Physician* of our souls : nor can Christian philosophy, whatever be thought of the Pagan, be more properly defined than in Plato's words: it is Θεαπτικὴ θεραπεία. The only true *method* of healing a distempered *soul*. But what need of this, if we are in perfect health ? If we are not diseased, we do not want a cure. If we are not sick, why should we seek for a "medicine to heal our sickness ?" What room is there, to talk of our being renewed in *knowledge* or *holiness*, "after the image wherein we were created," if we never have lost that image ? If we are as knowing and holy now, nay, far more so, than Adam was immediately after his creation ? If therefore, we take away this foundation, that man is by nature foolish and sinful, fallen short of the glorious image of God, the Christian system falls at once : nor will it deserve so honourable an appellation, as that of a "cunningly devised fable."

5. In considering this *Confutation of the Christian system*, I am under some difficulty from Dr. Taylor's manner of writing. It is his custom to say the same thing (sometimes in different, sometimes in nearly the same words) six or eight, perhaps twelve or fifteen times, in different parts of his book. Now I have accustomed myself for many years, to say one and the same thing once only. However, to comply with his manner as far as possible, I shall add at proper intervals, extracts from others, expressing nearly the same sentiment, which I have before expressed in my own words.

6. I am sensible, in speaking on so tender a point as this must needs be, to those who believe the Christian system, there is danger

of a warmth which does no honour to our cause, nor is it at all countenanced by the revelation which we defend. I desire neither to show, nor to feel this, but to “speak the truth in love,” (the only warmth which the gospel allows,) and to write with calmness, though not with indifference. There is likewise a danger of despising our opponents, and of speaking with an air of contempt or disdain. I would gladly keep clear of this also ; well knowing that a diffidence of ourselves, is far from implying a diffidence of our cause : I distrust myself, not my argument. O that the God of the Christians may be with me ! That his Spirit may give me understanding, and enable me to think and “speak as the Oracles of God,” without going from them to the right hand or to the left !

LEWISHAM, Nov. 30, 1756.

THE

DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN, &c. &c. &c.

PART I.

The past and present State of Mankind.

BEFORE we attempt to account for any fact, we should be well assured of the fact itself. First, therefore, let us inquire what is the real state of mankind ? And in the second place endeavour to account for it.

I. First, I say, let us inquire, What is the real State, with regard to Knowledge and Virtue, wherein mankind have been from the earliest times ? And what state are they in at this day ?

I. 1. What is the state, (to begin with the former branch of the inquiry,) with regard to knowledge and virtue, wherein, according to the most authentic accounts, mankind have been from the earliest times ? We have no authentic account of the state of mankind in the times antecedent to the deluge, but in the writings of Moses. What, then, according to these, was the state of mankind in those times ? Moses gives us an exact and full account : God then “saw that the wickedness of man was great, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” (Gen. vi. 5. 12, 13.) And this was not the case of only part of mankind ; but “all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” And accordingly God said, “The end of all flesh is come, for the earth is filled with violence through them.” Only Noah was “righteous before God.” (ch. vii. 1.) Therefore he and his household were spared, when

God "brought the flood upon the world of the ungodly," and destroyed them all from the face of the earth.

'Let us examine the most distinguishing features in this draught. Not barely the works of their hands, or the words of their tongue, but "every imagination of the thoughts of their heart was evil." The contagion had spread itself through the inner man ; had tainted the seat of their principles, and the source of their actions. But was there not some *mixture* of good ? No ; they were *only* evil. Not so much as a little leaven of piety, unless in one single family. But were there no *lucid intervals* ? No happy moments wherein virtue gained the ascendancy ? None : Every imagination, every thought was only evil continually.*'

2. Such was the state of mankind for at least sixteen hundred years. Men were corrupting themselves and each other, and proceeding from one degree of wickedness to another, till they were all (save eight persons) ripe for destruction. So deplorable was the state of the moral world, while the natural was in its highest perfection. And yet it is highly probable, that the inhabitants of the earth were then abundantly more numerous than ever they have been since, considering the length of their lives, falling little short of a thousand years, and the strength and vigour of their bodies, which we may easily gather from the time they were to continue : to say nothing of the fertility of the earth, probably far greater than it is at present. Consequently it was then capable of sustaining such a number of inhabitants, as could not now subsist on the produce of it.

3. Let us next take a view of the *families of the sons of Noah*, the inhabitants of the earth after the Flood. The first remarkable incident we read concerning them is, that while "they were all of one language, they said one to another, Let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth." It is not easy to determine, what were the peculiar aggravations which attended this attempt. But it is certain, there was daring wickedness therein, which brought upon them the very thing they feared. For "the Lord by confounding their language," (not their religious worship : Can we suppose God would confound this ?) "scattered them abroad upon the face of all the earth." (Gen. xi. 4—9.) Now whatever particulars in this account may be variously interpreted, thus much is clear and undeniable, That all these, that is, all the inhabitants of the earth had again "corrupted their way ;" the universal wickedness being legible in the universal punishment.

4. We have no account of their reforming their ways, of any universal or general repentance, before God separated Abraham to himself, to be the father of his chosen people. (Gen. xii. 1, 2.) Nor is there any reason to believe, that the rest of mankind were improved, either in wisdom or virtue, when "Lot and Abraham sepa-

* Mr. Hervey's Theron and Aspasio, Dial. 11.

rated themselves, and Lot pitched his tent toward Sodom." (*ibid.*) Of those among whom he dwelt, it is particularly remarked, " The men of Sodom" (and of ail " the cities of the plain) were wicked, and sinners before the Lord exceedingly," (xiii. 13,) so that not even " ten righteous persons" could be found among them: the consequence of which was, that " The Lord rained upon them brim-stone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." (xix. 24.)

5. We have no ground to suppose, that the other inhabitants of the earth, (Abraham with his family and descendants excepted,) had either the knowledge or the fear of God, from that time till Jacob went into Egypt. This was then, as well as for several ages after, the great seat of learning: insomuch that "the wisdom of the Egyptians" was celebrated even to a proverb. And indeed for this end, as well as "to save much people alive," (Gen. l. 20,) did "God send Joseph into Egypt, *even* to inform their princes after his will, and to teach their senators wisdom." (Psalm cv. 22.) And yet not long after his death, as their king *knew not* Joseph, so his people knew not God. Yea, they set him at defiance; they and their king provoked him more and more, and "hardened their hearts" against him: even after they had "seen his wonders in Egypt," after they had groaned under his repeated vengeance. They still added sin to sin, till they constrained the Lord to destroy them with an utter destruction; till the divided "waters returned and covered the chariots and horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh."

6. Nor were the other nations who then inhabited the earth, any better than the Egyptians: the true knowledge and spiritual worship of God being confined to the descendants of Abraham. " He had not dealt so with other nations, neither had the Heathens knowledge of his laws." (Psalm cxlvii. 20.) And in what state were the Israelites themselves? How did they worship the God of their fathers? Why even these were "a stubborn and rebellious generation, a generation that set not their heart aright." (Psalm lxxviii. 8.) "They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his law." (ver. 10. Psalm cvi 7. Ex. xiv. 11, 12.) "They provoked him at the sea, even at the Red Sea;" the very place where he had so signally delivered them. "They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image," (Psalm cvi. 19,) where they had heard the Lord, but a little before, saying out of the midst of the fire, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image: thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." And how amazing was their behaviour during those whole forty years that they sojourned in the wilderness. Even while he "led them in the day time with a cloud, and all the night with a light of fire?" (Psalm lxxviii. 14.) Such were the knowledge and virtue of God's peculiar people, (certainly the most knowing and virtuous nation which was then to be found upon the face of the earth,) till God brought them into the land of Canaan: considerably more than two thousand years from the creation of the world.

None, I presume, will say, There was any other nation at that

time more knowing and more virtuous than the Israelites. None can say this while he professes to believe, according to the scriptural account, That Israel was then under a theocracy, under the immediate government of God : That he conversed with their subordinate governor "face to face, as a man talketh with his friend ;" and that God was daily through him conveying such instructions to them, as they were capable of receiving.

7. Shall we turn our eyes for a moment from the scriptural, to the profane account of mankind from the earliest ages? What was the general sentiment of the most polite and knowing nation, the Romans, when their learning was in its utmost perfection? Let one, who certainly was no bigot or enthusiast, speak for the rest. And he speaks home to the point.

*Fuit ante Helenam mulier teterrima Belli
Causa: sed ignotis perierunt mortibus omnes
Quos venerem incertam rapientes, more ferarum,
Viribus editior cædebat, ut in grege taurus.*

Full many a war has been for women wag'd
E'er half the world in Helen's cause engag'd :
But unrecorded in historic verse
Obscurely died those savage ravishers :
Who like brute beasts the female bore away,
Till some superior brute, re-eiz'd the prey.
As a wild bull, his rival bull o'er thrown,
Claims the whole subject herd, and reigns alone.

I doubt he who gives this, not as his peculiar opinion, but as what was then a generally received notion, would scarce have allowed even so much as Juvenal,

*Pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
In terris.*

Chastity did once, I grant, remain
On earth, and flourish'd in old Saturn's reign.

Unless one should suppose the reign of Saturn to have expired, when Adam was driven out of paradise.

I cannot forbear adding another picture of the ancient dignity of human nature, drawn by the same masterly hand. Before men dwelt in cities, he says, thus

*Turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
Certabant pugnis, d' in fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armis, qua post fabricaverat usus.*

The human herd, unbroken and untaught,
For acorns first, and grassy couches fought :
With fists, and then with clubs, maintain'd the fray,
Till urg'd by hate they found a quicker way,
And forg'd pernicious arms, and learnt the art to slay.

What a difference is there between this, and the gay, florid accounts, which many moderns give of their own species.

8. But to return to more authentic accounts. At the time when God brought the Israelites into Canaan, in what state were the rest of mankind? Doubtless in nearly the same, with the Canaanites; with the Amorites, Hittites, Perrizzites, and the rest of the seven

nations. But the *wickedness* of these, we know, was *full*: they were corrupt in the highest degree. All manner of vice, all ungodliness and unrighteousness reigned among them without control. And therefore the wise and just Governor of the world gave them up to a swift and total destruction.

9. Of Israel indeed we read, that they “served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua.” (Jos. xxiv. 31.) And yet even at that time, they did not serve him alone; they were not free from gross idolatry. Otherwise there had been no need of his giving them that exhortation a little before his death. “Now, therefore, put away the strange gods which are among you, the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the river,” (Jordan.) (ibid. ver. 23.) What gods these were, we learn by the words of Amos, cited by St. Stephen, “O ye house of Israel, have ye offered sacrifices to me, by the space of forty years? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them.” (Actvii. 42, 43.)

10. The sacred history of what occurred within a short space after the death of Joshua, for some hundreds of years, even till the time that Samuel judged Israel, gives us a large account of their astonishing wickedness, during almost that whole period. It is true, just “when God smote them, then they sought him; they returned and inquired after God. Yet their heart was not right with him, neither were they steadfast in his covenant.” (Psm. lxxviii. 34. 37.) And we find little alteration among them for the better, in the succeeding ages: insomuch that in the reign of Ahab, about nine hundred years before Christ, there were only “seven thousand left in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal.” (1 Kings xix. 18.) What manner of men they were for the next three hundred years, we may learn from the books of the kings and from the prophets: whence it fully appears that except a few short intervals, they were given up to all manner of abominations; by reason of which the name of the Most High was the more abundantly blasphemed among the Heathens. And this continued till their open rebellion against God, brought upon the whole nation of the Jews, (an hundred and thirty-four years after the captivity of the ten tribes, and about six hundred before Christ,) those terrible and long deserved calamities, which made them a spectacle to all that were round about them. The writings of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Jeremiah, leave us no room to think, that they were reformed by those calamities. Nor was there any lasting reformation in the time of Ezra, or of Nehemiah and Malachi: but they were still, as their forefathers had been, “a faithless and stubborn generation.” Such were they likewise, as we may gather from the books of Maccabees and Josephus, to the very time when Christ came into the world.

11. Our blessed Lord has given us a large description of those who were then the most eminent for religion. “Ye devour,” says he, ‘widows’ houses, and for a pretence make long prayers. Ye make

your proselytes two-fold more the children of hell than yourselves. Ye neglect the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith. Ye make clean the outside of the cup, but within are full of extortion and excess. Ye are like whitened sepulchres, outwardly beautiful, but within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers; how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (Matt. xxiii. 14, &c.) And to these very men, after they had murdered that Just One, his faithful follower declared, "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." (Acts vii. 51.) And so they continued to do, till the wrath of God did indeed "come upon them to the uttermost;" till eleven hundred thousand of them were destroyed, their city and temple levelled with the dust, and above ninety thousand, sold for slaves and scattered into all lands.

12. Such in all generations were the lineal children of Abraham, who had so unspeakable advantages over the rest of mankind; "To whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;" among whom therefore we may reasonably expect to find the greatest eminence of knowledge and virtue. If these then were so stupidly, brutishly ignorant, so desperately wicked; what can we expect from the Heathen world, from them who had not the knowledge either of his law or promises? Certainly we cannot expect to find more goodness among them. But let us make a fair and impartial inquiry: and that not among wild and barbarous nations, but the most civilized and refined. What then were the ancient Romans? The people whose virtue is so highly extolled, and so warmly commended to our imitation? We have their character given by one who cannot deceive or be deceived, the unerring Spirit of God. And what account does he give of these best of men, these heroes of antiquity? "When they knew God," says he, at least as to his *eternity* and *power*, (both implied in that appellation, which occurs more than once in their own poet, *Pater omnipotens, Almighty Father*) "they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful." (Rom. i. 21, &c.) So far from it that one of their oracles of wisdom, (though once he stumbled on that great truth, *Nemo unquam vir magnus sine afflato divino fuit*; there never was any great man, without the afflatus or inspiration of God; yet almost in the same breath, does not scruple to ask, *Quis pro virtute aut sapientia gratias diis dedit unquam?* Who ever thanked God for virtue or wisdom? No, why should he; since these are "his own acquisition; the pure result of his own industry?" Accordingly another virtuous Roman has left it on record, as an unquestioned maxim.

Hæc saties est orare Jovem quæ donat et aifert :
Det vitam ; det opes : æquum mi animum ipse parabo.

Enough for common benefits to pray,
Which Jove can either give, or take away:
Long life or wealth his bounty may bestow
Wisdom and virtue to myself I owe.

So “vain were they become in their imaginations ! So were their foolish hearts darkened !” (Rom. i. 21, &c.)

13. But this was only the first step. They did not stop here. “Professing themselves wise,” they yet sunk into such gross, astonishing folly as to “change the glory of the incorruptible God,” (whom they might have known even from their own writers to be

Vastam
Mens agitans molem, et magno se corpore miscens,
The all-informing soul
That fills the mighty mass, and moves the whole,)

“into an image made like to corruptible man, yea, to birds, to beasts, to creeping things !” What wonder was it then, that after they had thus “changed his glory into an image, God gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves ?” How justly, when they had “changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator,” did he “for this cause,” punishing sin by sin, “give them up unto vile affections. For even the women did change the natural use into that which is against nature.” Yea, the modest honourable Roman matrons, (so little were they ashamed !) wore their *priapi* openly on their breasts. “And likewise the men burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working that which is unseemly.” What an amazing testimony of this is left us on record, even by the most modest of all the Roman poets !

Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin :

How does this pattern of Heathen chastity avow, without either fear or shame, as if it were an innocent at least, if not laudable passion. “their burning in lust one toward another !” And did men of the finest taste in the nation censure the song, or the subject of it ? We read nothing of this : on the contrary, the universal honour and esteem paid to the writer, and that by persons of the highest rank, plainly shows that the case of Corydon, as it was not uncommon in any part of the Roman dominions, so it was not conceived to be any blemish, either to him or his master, but an innocent infirmity.

Meantime how delicate an idea of *love*, had this favourite of Rome and of the muses ? Hear him explaining himself a little more fully, on this tender point.

Eheu ! quam pingui macer est mihi taurus in agro !
Idem amor exitium est pecori, pecorisque magistro.

Idem amor ! The same love in the bull and in the man ! What elegance of sentiment ! Is it possible any thing can exceed this ? One would imagine nothing could, had not the same chaste poet furnished us with yet another scene, more abundantly shocking than this.

Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore juvenci !

“He comforts Pasiphae with the love of her milk-white bull !” *Nihil supra !* The condoling a woman on her unsuccessful amour with a bull, shows a brutality which nothing can exceed ! How justly then

does the Apostle add, as “they did not like” (or *desire*) “to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to an undiscerning mind, to do those things which are not convenient.” In consequence of this, they were “filled with all unrighteousness,” vice of every kind, and in every degree: in particular “with fornication,” (taking the word in its largest sense, as including every sin of the kind,) “with wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, with envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity: being haters of God,” the true God, the God of Israel, to whom they allowed no place among all their herd of deities: “despiteful, proud, boasters,” in as eminent a degree as ever was any nation under heaven: “inventors of evil things” in great abundance, of *mille nocendi artes*, both in peace and war: “disobedient to parents,” although duty to these is supposed to be inscribed on the hearts of the most barbarous nations: “covenant-breakers,” even of those of the most solemn kind, those wherein the public faith was engaged by their supreme magistrate: which notwithstanding they made no manner of scruple of breaking, whenever they saw good: only colouring over their perfidiousness, by giving those magistrates into their hands with whom the *covenant* was made. And what was this to the purpose? Is the king of France, or the republic of Holland, at liberty to violate their most solemn treaties at pleasure, provided they give up to the king of England, the ambassador or general by whom that treaty was made? What would all Europe have said of the late Czar, if instead of punctually performing the engagements made with the Porte when in his distress, he had only given up the persons by whom he transacted, and immediately broke through them all? There is therefore no room to say

*Modo Punica scripta supervent,
Non minus infamis forte latina fides.*

Perhaps, if the Carthaginian writings were extant, *Roman faith* would be as infamous as *Punic*. We need them not. In vain have they destroyed the Carthaginian writings: for their own sufficiently testify of them; and fully prove that in perfidy, the natives of Carthage could not excel the senate and people of Rome.

14. They were as a nation, *ασεγγοι*. “*Void of natural affection*,” even to their own bowels. Witness the universal custom, which obtained for several ages in Rome, and all its dependencies, (as it had done before through all the cities of Greece,) when in their highest repute for wisdom and virtue, of *exposing* their own new-born children, more or fewer of them, as every man pleased, when he had as many as he thought good to keep, throwing them out to perish by cold and hunger, unless some more merciful wild beast shortened their pain, and provided them a sepulchre. Nor do I remember a single Greek or Roman, of all those that occasionally mention it, ever complaining of this diabolical custom, or fixing the least touch of blame upon it. Even the tender mother in Terence, who had some compassion for her helpless infant, does not dare to acknowledge it

to her husband, without that remarkable preface, *Ut misere superstitionis sumus omnes*; as we women are all miserably superstitious.

15. I would desire those gentlemen who are so very severe upon the Israelites, for killing the children of the Canaanites, at their entrance into the land of Canaan, to spend a few thoughts on this. Not to insist, that the Creator is the absolute Lord and Proprietor of the lives of all his creatures: that as such he may at any time, without the least injustice, take away the life which he has given: that he may do this, in whatsoever manner, and by whatever instruments he pleases: and consequently may inflict death on any creature by whom he pleases, without any blame either to him or them: not to insist, I say, on this, or many other things which might be offered, let us at present fix on this single consideration. The Israelites destroyed the children for some weeks or months: the Greeks and Romans for above a thousand years. The one put them out of their pain at once, doubtless by the shortest and easiest way. The others were not so compassionate as to cut their throats, but left them to pine away by a lingering death. Above all, the Hebrews destroyed only the children of their enemies; the Romans destroyed their own. O fair pattern indeed! Where shall we find a parallel to this virtue? I read of a modern, who took up a child, that fell from its mother's womb, and threw it back into the flames. (Pure, genuine human nature!) and reason good: for it was the child of an heretic. But what evil, ye worthies of ancient Rome, did ye find in *your own* children? I must still say, this is without a parallel, even in the Papal history.

16. They were *implacable, unmerciful*. Witness (one or two instances of ten thousand) poor, gray-headed Hannibal, (whom, very probably, had we any other accounts of him than those which were given by his bitterest enemies, we should have reverenced as one of the most amiable of men, as well as the most valiant of all the ancient heathens,) hunted from nation to nation, and never quitted till he fell by his own hand. Witness the famous suffrage, “*Delenda est Carthago. Let Carthage be destroyed.*” Why? It was *imperii æmula*: the rival of the Roman glory. These were open, undeniable evidences of the public national placability and mercy of the Romans. Need instances of a more private nature be added? Behold then one for all: In that glory of Rome, that prodigy of virtue, the great, the celebrated Cato. *Cato the Elder*, when any of his domestics had worn themselves out in his service, and grew decrepid with age, constantly turned them out to starve, and was much applauded for his frugality in so doing. But what mercy was this? Just such as that which dwelt in Cato of Utica, who repaid the tenderness of his servant endeavouring to save his life, to prevent his tearing open his wound, by striking him on the face with such violence, as to fill his mouth with blood. These are thy gods, O deism! These are the patterns so zealously recommended to our imitation!

17. And what was the real character of that hero, whom Cato

himself so admired ? Whose cause he espoused with such eagerness, with such unwearyed diligence ? Of Pompey the Great ? Surely never did any man purchase that title at so cheap a rate ! What made him great ? The villany of Perpenna, and the treachery of Pharnaces. Had not the one murdered his friend, the other rebelled against his father, where had been Pompey's greatness ? So this stalking-horse of a party procured his reputation in the commonwealth. And when it was procured, how did he use it ? Let his own poet, Lucan, speak—

*Nec Cæsar ferre priorem,
Pompeiusve parentem potuit.*

Nor Cæsar could to a superior look :
Nor patriot Pompey could an equal brook !

He would bear no equal ! And this a senator of Rome ! Nay, the grand patron of the republic ! But what a republican himself, when this principle was the spring of all his designs and actions ! Indeed a less amiable character it is not easy to find, among all the great men of antiquity : ambitious, vain, haughty, surly, and overbearing, beyond the common rate of men. And what virtue had he to balance these faults ? I can scarcely find one, even in Lucan's account : it does not appear that in the latter part of his life, he had even military virtues. What proof did he give of personal courage, in all his war with Cæsar ? What instances of eminent conduct ? None at all if we may credit his friend Cicero ; who complains heavily to Atticus, that he acted like a madman, and would ruin the cause he had undertaken to defend.

18. Let none therefore look for *placability* or *mercy* in Pompey, But was there any unmercifulness in Cæsar ?

“ Who than Julius hopes to rise,
More brave, more generous, or more wise ? ”

Of his courage and sense there can be no doubt. And much may be said with regard to his contest with Pompey, even for the justice of his cause. For with him he certainly fought for life, rather than glory : of which he had the strongest conviction (though he was ashamed to own it) when he passed the Rubicon. Nor can it be doubted but he was often merciful. It is no proof of the contrary, that he rode up and down his ranks during the battle of Pharsalia, and cried to those who were engaged with the pretty gentlemen of Pompey's army, *Miles, faciem feri* ; “ Soldier, strike at the face.” For this greatly shortened the dispute, with those who were more afraid of losing their beauty than their lives, and so prevented the effusion of much blood. But I cannot get over (to say nothing of the myriads of common Gauls whom he destroyed) a short sentence in his commentaries, *Vercingetorix per tormenta necatus*. Who was this Vercingetorix ? As brave a man, and (considering his years) as great a general as even Cæsar. What was his crime ? The love of his parents, wife, children, country, and sacrificing all things in the defence of them. And how did Cæsar treat him on this account ? He tortured him to death. O Roman mercy ! Did not

Brutus and Cassius avenge Vercingetorix rather than Pompey ? How well was Rome represented in the prophetic vision, by that beast, “dreadful and terrible, which had great iron teeth, and devoured, and brake in pieces, and stamped under his feet” all other kingdoms !

II. 1. Such is the state, with regard to knowledge and virtue, wherein, according to the most authentic accounts, mankind was, from the earliest times, for above four thousand years. Such nearly did it continue, during the decline, and since the destruction of the Roman empire. But we will waive all that is past, if it only appears that mankind are virtuous and wise at this day. This then is the point we are at present to consider. Are men in general now wise and virtuous ?

Our ingenious countryman, Mr. Brerewood, after his most careful and laborious inquiries, computes, that supposing that part of the earth, which we know to be inhabited, were divided into thirty equal parts, nineteen of these are heathen still : and of the remaining eleven, six are Mahometan, and only five Christian. Let us take as fair and impartial a survey as we can, of the heathens first, and then of the Mahometans and Christians.

And, first, of the heathens. What manner of men are these, as to virtue and knowledge at this day ? : Many of late, who still bear the Christian name, have entertained very honourable thoughts of the old heathens. They cannot believe them to have been so stupid and senseless as they have been represented to be : particularly, with regard to idolatry, in worshipping birds, beasts, and creeping things. Much less can they credit the stories told of many nations, the Egyptians in particular,

— — — — — “Who are said.
To have set the leek they after pray'd to.”

But if they do not consider who they are that transmit to us these accounts, namely, both those writers who, they profess to believe, spoke “as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” and those whom perhaps they value more, the most credible of their contemporary heathens : If, I say, they forget this, do they not consider the *present* state of the heathen world ? Now, allowing the bulk of the ancient heathens (which itself is not easily proved) to have had as much understanding as the modern, we have no pretence to suppose they had more. Whatever therefore they were, we may safely gather from what they are : we may judge of the past by the present. Would we know then (to begin with a part of the world known to very early antiquity) what manner of men the heathens in Africa were two or three thousand years ago ? Inquire what they are now ; who are genuine Pagans still, not tainted either with Mahometanism or Christianity. They are to be found in abundance, either in Negro-land, or round the Cape of Good Hope. Now what measure of knowledge have the natives of these countries ? I do not say in metaphysics, mathematics, or astronomy. Of these it is plain they know just as much as their four-footed brethren. The lion and the

man are equally accomplished with regard to this knowledge. I will not ask, what they know of the nature of government, of the respective rights of kings, and various orders of subjects. In this regard, a herd of men are manifestly inferior to a herd of elephants. But let us view them with respect to common life. What do they know of the things they continually stand in need of? How do they build habitations for themselves and their families? How select and prepare their food? Clothe and adorn their persons? As to their habitations, it is certain, I will not say our horses, (particularly those belonging to the nobility and gentry,) but an English peasant's dogs, nay, his very swine are more commodiously lodged. And as to their food, apparel, and ornaments, they are just suitable to their edifices.

“Your nicer Hottentots think meet
With guts and tripe to deck their feet,
With downcast eyes on Totta’s legs,
The love-sick youth most humbly begs,
She woud not from his sight remove,
At once his breakfast and his ore.”

Such is the knowledge of these accomplished animals in things which cannot but daily employ their thoughts: and wherein consequently they cannot avoid exerting to the uttermost both their natural and acquired understanding.

And what are their present attainments in virtue? Are they not, one and all, “without God in the world?” Having either no knowledge of him at all, no conception of any thing he has to do with them, or they with him: or such conceptions as are far worse than none, as make him such an one as themselves. And what are their social virtues? What are their dispositions and behaviour between man and man? Are they eminent for justice? For mercy, or truth? As to mercy, they know not what it means, being continually cutting each other’s throats, from generation to generation, and selling for slaves as many of those who fall into their hands, as on that consideration only they do not murder. Justice they have none; no courts of justice at all; no public method of redressing wrong, but every man does what is right in his own eyes, till a stronger than he beats out his brains for so doing. And they have just as much regard to truth; cozening, cheating, and over-reaching every man that believes a word they say. Such are the moral, such the intellectual perfections, according to the latest and most accurate accounts, of the present Heathens, who are diffused in great numbers over a fourth part of the known world!

3. It is true, that in the new world, in America, they seem to breathe a purer air, and to be in general men of a stronger understanding, and a less savage temper. Among these then we may surely find higher degrees of knowledge as well as virtue. But in order to form a just conception of them, we must not take our account from their enemies; from any that would justify themselves by blackening those whom they seek to destroy. No, but let us inquire of more impartial judges, concerning those whom they have

personally known, the Indians bordering upon our own settlements, from New-England down to Georgia.

We cannot learn, that there is any great difference in point of knowledge, between any of these, from east to west, or from north to south. They are all equally unacquainted with European learning, being total strangers to every branch of literature, having not the least conception of any part of philosophy, speculative or practical: Neither have they (whatever accounts some have given) any such thing as a regular, civil government among them. They have no laws of any kind, unless a few temporary rules made in and for the times of war. They are likewise utter strangers to the arts of peace, having scarcely any such thing as an artificer in the nation. They know nothing of building; having only poor, miserable, ill-contrived huts, far inferior to many English dog-kennels. Their clothing, till of late, was only skins of beasts, commonly of deer, hanging down before and behind them. Now, among those who have commerce with our nation, it is frequently a blanket wrapped about them. Their food is equally delicate; pounded Indian corn sometimes mixed with water, and so eaten at once: sometimes kneaded into cakes, meal and bran together, and half baked upon the coals. Fish or flesh, dried in the sun, is frequently added to this; and now and then a piece of tough, fresh-killed deer.

Such is the knowledge of the Americans, whether in things of an abstruser nature, or in the affairs of common life. And this, so far as we can learn, is the condition of all, without any considerable difference. But in point of religion, there is a very material difference between the Northern and Southern Indians. Those in the north are idolaters of the lowest kind: If they do not worship the Devil appearing in person, (which many firmly believe they do, many think incredible,) certainly they worship the most vile and contemptible idols. It were more excusable if they only "turned the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of corruptible man;" yea, or "of birds, or of four-footed beasts, or reptiles," or any creature which God has made. But their idols are more horrid and deformed than any thing in the visible creation: and their whole worship is at once the highest affront to the divine, and disgrace to the human nature.

On the contrary, the Indians of our southern provinces do not appear to have any worship at all. By the most diligent inquiry from those who had spent many years among them, I could never learn that any of the Indian nations, who border on Georgia and Carolina, have any public worship, of any kind: or any private. For they have no idea of prayer. It is not without much difficulty that one can make any of them understand what is meant by prayer. And when they do, they cannot be made to apprehend, that God will answer, or even hear it. They say, "*He that sitteth in heaven is too high, he is too far off to hear us.*" In consequence of which they leave him to himself, and manage their affairs without him.

Only the Chicasaws, of all the Indian nations, are an exception to this.

I believe, it will be found on the strictest inquiry, that the whole body of southern Indians, as they have no letters and no laws, so properly speaking, have no religion at all. So that every one does what he sees good: and if it appears wrong to his neighbour, he usually comes upon him unawares, and shoots or scalps him alive. They are likewise all (I could never find any exception) gluttons, drunkards, thieves, dissemblers, liars. They are *implacable*, never forgiving an injury or affront, or being satisfied with less than blood. They are *unmerciful*, killing all whom they take prisoners in war, with the most exquisite tortures. They are murderers of fathers, murderers of mothers, murderers of their own children: It being a common thing for a son to shoot his father or mother, because they are old and past labour, and for a woman either to procure abortion, or to throw her child into the next river, because she will go to the war with her husband. Indeed husbands properly speaking, they have none; for any man leaves his wife, so called, to pleasure; who frequently in return, cuts the throats of all the children she has had by him.

The Chicasaws alone seem to have some notion of an intercourse between man and a superior being. They speak much of their *beloved ones*; with whom they say, they converse both day and night. But their *beloved ones* teach them to eat and drink from morning to night, and in a manner from night to morning: for they rise at any hour of the night when they wake, and eat and drink as much as they can, and sleep again. Their beloved ones likewise expressly command them, to torture and burn all their prisoners. Their manner of doing it is this: They hold lighted canes to their arms and legs, and several parts of their body, for some time, and then for awhile they take them away. They also stick burning pieces of wood in their flesh; in which condition they keep them from morning to evening. Such are at present the knowledge and virtue of the native Heathens, over another fourth part of the known world.

4. In Asia, however, we are informed, that the case is widely different. For although the Heathens bordering on Europe, the thousands and myriads of Tartars have not much to boast either as to knowledge or virtue; and although the numerous little nations under the Mogul who retain their original Heathenism, are nearly on a level with them, as are the inhabitants of the many large and populous islands in the eastern seas: yet we hear high encomiums of the Chinese, who are as numerous as all these together: some late travellers assuring us, that China alone has fifty-eight millions of inhabitants. Now these have been described as men of the deepest penetration, the highest learning, and the strictest integrity. And such doubtless they are, at least with regard to their understanding, if we will believe their own proverb, "The Chinese have two eyes, the Europeans one, and other men none at all."

And one circumstance, it must be owned, is much in their favour: They live some thousands of miles off. So that if it were affirmed, That every Chinese had literally three eyes, it would be difficult for us to disprove it. Nevertheless there is room to doubt even of their understanding: Nay, one of the arguments often brought to prove the greatness, to me clearly demonstrates the littleness of it: namely, The thirty thousand letters of their alphabet. To keep an alphabet of thirty hundred letters, could never be reconciled to common sense: since every alphabet ought to be as short, simple, and easy as possible. No more can we reconcile to any degree of common sense, their crippling all the women in the empire, by a silly, senseless affectation of squeezing their feet, till they bear no proportion to their bodies: so that the feet of a woman at thirty, must still be as small as they would be naturally when four years old. But in order to see the true measure of their understanding in the clearest light, let us look not at women or the vulgar, but at the nobility, the wisest, the politest part of the nation. Look at the Mandarins, the glory of the empire, and see any, every one of them at his meals, not deigning to use his own hands, but having his meat put into his mouth, by two servants planted for that purpose, one on his right hand, the other on his left! O the deep understanding of the noble lubber that sits in the midst, and

“Hiat, cœi pullus hirundinis!”

Gapes, as the young swallow for his food.

Surely, an English ploughman, or a Dutch sailor, would have too much sense to endure it. If you say, Nay, the Mandarian would not endure it, but that it is a custom: I answer, Undoubtedly it is; but how came it to be a custom? Such a custom could not have begun, much less have become general, but through a general, and marvellous want of common sense.

What their learning is now, I know not: but notwithstanding their boast of its antiquity, it was certainly very low and contemptible in the last century, when they were so astonished at the skill of the French Jesuits, and honoured them as almost more than human. And whatever progress they may have made since in the knowledge of astronomy for calculating eclipses, and other curious rather than useful sciences, it is certain, they are still utterly ignorant of what it most of all concerns them to know. They know not God any more than the Hottentots: they are all idolaters to a man. And so tenacious are they of their national idolatry, that even those whom the French missionaries called converts, yet continued one and all, to worship Confucius, and the souls of their ancestors. It is true, that when this was strongly represented at Rome, by an honest Dominican who came from thence, a bull was issued out and sent over into China, forbidding them to do it any longer. But the good fathers kept it privately among themselves, saying, The Chinese were not able to bear it.

Such is their religion with respect to God. But are they not emi-

ment for all social virtues, all that have place between man and man ? Yes, according to the accounts which some have given. According to these, they are the glory of mankind, and may be a pattern to all Europe. But have not we some reason to doubt, if these accounts are true ? Are pride and laziness good ingredients of social virtue ? And can all Europe equal either the laziness or pride of the Chinese nobility and gentry ? Who are too stately or too indolent even to put the meat into their own mouths ? Yet they are not too proud, or too indolent, to oppress, to rob, to defraud all that fall into their hands : how flagrant instances of this may any one find even in the account of Lord Anson's voyage ! Exactly agreeing with the accounts given by all our countrymen, who have traded in any part of China : as well as with the observation made by a late writer, in his geographical grammar. ' ' Trade and commerce, or rather cheating and over-reaching, is the natural bent and genius of the Chinese. Gain is their god ; they prefer this to every thing besides. A stranger is in great danger of being cheated, if he trusts to his own judgment. And if he employs a Chinese-broker, it is well if he does not join with the merchant to cheat the stranger. Their laws oblige them to certain rules of civility, in their words and actions. And they are naturally a fawning, cringing generation : but the greatest hypocrites on the face of the earth.'

5. Such is the boasted virtue of those who are beyond all degrees of comparison the best and wisest of all the Heathens in Asia. And how little preferable to them are those in Europe ! Rather, how many degrees beneath them ? Vast numbers of these are within the borders of Muscovy. But how amazingly ignorant ! How totally void both of civil and sacred wisdom ! How shockingly savage both in their tempers and manners ! Their idolatry is of the basest and vilest kind. They not only worship the work of their own hands, but idols of the most horrid and detestable forms that men or devils could devise. Equally savage, (or more so, if more can be,) as is well known, are the natives of Lapland : and indeed of all the countries which have been discovered to the north of Muscovy or Sweden. In truth, the bulk of these nations seem to be considerably more barbarous, not only than the men near the Cape of Good Hope, but than many tribes in the brute creation.

Thus have we seen what is the present state of the Heathens in every part of the known world. And these still make up, according to the preceding calculation, very near two-thirds of mankind. Let us now calmly and impartially consider, What manner of men the Mahometans in general are.

6. An ingenious writer, who, a few years ago, published a pompous translation of the Koran, takes great pains to give us a very favourable opinion both of Mahomet and his followers. But he cannot wash the Ethiop white. After all, men who have but a moderate share of reason, cannot but observe in his Koran, even as polished by Mr. Sale, the most gross and impious absurdities. To cite particulars is not now my business. It may suffice to observe in general, that human understanding must be debased to an inconceivable de-

gree, in those who can swallow such absurdities as divinely revealed. And yet we know the Mahometans not only condemn all who cannot swallow them to everlasting fire; not only appropriate to themselves the title of *Mussulmen*, or *True Believers*; but even anathematize with the utmost bitterness, and adjudge to eternal destruction, all their brethren of the sect of *Hali*, all who contend for a figurative interpretation of them.

That these men then have no knowledge or love of God is undeniably manifest, not only from their gross, horrible notions of him, but from their not loving their brethren. But they have not always so weighty a cause to hate and murder one another, as *difference of opinion*. Mahometans will butcher each other by thousands, without so plausible a plea as this. Why is it that such numbers of Turks and Persians have stabbed one another in cool blood? Truly because they differ in the manner of *dressing their head*. The Ottoman vehemently maintains, (for he has unquestionable *tradition* on his side,) that a *Mussulman* should wear a *round turban*. Whereas the Persian insists upon his liberty of conscience, and will wear it *picked before*. So, for this wonderful reason, when a more plausible one is wanting, they beat out each other's brains from generation to generation. .

It is not, therefore, strange, that ever since the religion of Mahome appeared in the world, the espousers of it, particularly those under the Turkish emperor, have been as wolves and tigers to all other nations, rending and tearing all that fell into their merciless paws, and grinding them with their iron teeth: that numberless cities are razed from the foundation, and only their name remaining: that many countries which were once as the garden of God, are now a desolate wilderness; and that so many once numerous and powerful nations are vanished away from the earth! Such was, and is at this day the rage, the fury, the revenge, of these destroyers of human-kind!

7. Proceed we now to the Christian world. But we must not judge of Christians in general, from those who are scattered through the Turkish dominions, the Armenian, Georgian, Mingrelian Christians: nor indeed from any others of the Greek communion. The gross, barbarous ignorance, the deep, stupid superstition, the blind and bitter zeal, and the endless thirst after vain jangling and strife of words, which have reigned for many ages in the Greek church, and well-nigh banished true religion from among them; make these scarcely worthy of the Christian name, and lay an insuperable stumbling-block before the Mahometans.

8. Perhaps those of the Romish communion may say, 'What wonder, that this is the case with heretics!—With those who have erred from the Catholic faith, nay, and left the pale of the church? But what is the case with them who have not left that church, and who retain the Roman faith still? Yea, with the most zealous of all its patrons, the inhabitants of Italy, of Spain and Portugal? Wherein do they excel the Greek church, except in *Italianism*? received by tradition from their Heathen fathers, and diffused through every city and village. They may indeed praise chastity and rail at women, as loudly as their forefather Juvenal. But what is the moral of all this?

“Nonne putas melius, quod tecum pusio dormit?”

This it must be acknowledged, is the glory of the Romish church. Herein it does excel the Greek.

They excel it likewise in Deism. Perhaps there is no country in the world, at least, in that part of it, which bears the Christian name wherein so large a proportion of the men of education, are absolute Deists, if not Atheists, as Italy. And from hence the plague has spread far and wide, through France in particular. So that did not temporal motives restrain, no small part of the French nobility and gentry, would pay no more regard to the Christian revelation, than do the Mandarins in China.

They excel still more in murder, both private and public. Instances of the former abound all over Italy, Spain, and Portugal. And the frequency of shedding blood has taken away all that horror which otherwise might attend it. Take one instance of a thousand. An English gentleman was some years ago at an entertainment in Brescia, when one who was near him whispered a few words in his ear, which he did not well understand. He asked his host, ‘What did that gentleman mean by these words?’ And was answered, ‘That he will murder you. And an Italian is never worse than his word in this. You have no way but to be beforehand with him.’ This he rejected with abhorrence. But his host, it seems, being not of so tender a conscience sent a stranger to him in the morning, who said, ‘Sir, look out of your window, I have done his business. There he lies. You will please to give me my pay.’ He pulled out a handful of money, in great disorder, and cried, ‘There, take what you will.’ The other replied, ‘Sir, I am a man of honour: I take only my pay:’ took a small piece of silver, and retired.

This was *a man of honour* among the Christians of the Romish church! And many such are to be found all over Italy, whose trade it is, to cut throats; to stab, for hire, in cool blood. They have *men of conscience* too. Such were two of the Catholic soldiers under the famous Duke of Alva, who broke into the house of a poor countryman in Flanders, butchered him and his wife with five or six children; and after they had finished their work, sat down, to enjoy the fruit of their labour. But in the midst of their meal, conscience awaked. One of them started up in great emotion, and cried out, ‘O Lord! What have I done? As I hope for salvation, I have eaten flesh in Lent!'

The same sort of *conscience* undoubtedly it was, which constrained the late most Christian king, in defiance of the most solemn treaties, yea, of all ties, divine and human, most graciously to murder so many thousands of his quiet unresisting subjects: to order his dragoons, wherever they found the Protestants worshipping God, to fall in upon them, sword in hand, without any regard to sex or age. It was conscience, no question, which induced so many of the dukes of Savoy, notwithstanding the public faith engaged over and over, to shed the blood of their loyal subjects, the Vaudois, like water, to ravage their fields and destroy their cities. What but *conscience* could move the good Catholics of a neighbouring kingdom in the last century, to

murder (according to their own account,) two hundred and fifteen thousand protestants in six months ? A costly sacrifice this ! What is a hecatomb, a hundred oxen, to two hundred thousand men ? And yet what is even this to the whole number of victims who have been offered up in Europe since the beginning of the reformation ? Partly by war, partly by the inquisition, and a thousand other methods of Romish cruelty ? No less within forty years, if the computation of an eminent writer be just, than five and forty millions !

Such is the conscience, such the religion of Romish Christians ! Of their *inquisition*, (*the house of mercy*, as it is most unfortunately called,) I should give some account, but that it has been largely described by others. Yet it may not be improper to give a specimen of that mercy which they show to those under their care. At the *act of faith*, so called, which was celebrated some years ago, when Dr. Geddes was in Portugal, a prisoner, who had been confined nine years, was brought out to execution. Looking up and seeing what he had not seen for so long a time, the sun in the midst of heaven, he cried out, ‘ How can any who sees that glorious creature, worship any but the God that made it ? ’ The *father* who attended, immediately ordered a gag to be run through his lip, that he might speak no more.

See the Christians, who have received all the advantages of education ; all the helps of ancient and modern learning ! ‘ Nay, but we have still greater helps than they : we are *reformed* from the errors of popery : we *protest* against all those novel corruptions, with which the church of Rome has polluted ancient Christianity. The enormities, therefore, of popish countries, are not to be charged upon us : we are Protestants, and have nothing to do with the vices and villanies of Romish nations.’

9. Have we not ? Are Protestant nations nothing concerned in those melancholy reflections of Mr. Cowley. ‘ If twenty thousand naked Americans were not able to resist the assaults of but twenty well-armed Spaniards, how is it possible for one honest man to defend himself against twenty thousand knaves, who are all furnished *cap-a-pe* with the defensive arms of worldly prudence, and the offensive too of craft and malice ? He will find no less odds than this against him, if he have much to do in human affairs. Do you wonder then that a virtuous man should love to be alone ? It is hard for him to be otherwise. He is so when he is among ten thousand. Nor is it so uncomfortable, to be alone without any other creature, as it is to be alone in the midst of wild beasts. Man is to man all kinds of beasts, a fawning dog, a roaring lion, a thieving fox, a robbing wolf, a dissembling crocodile, a treacherous decoy, and a rapacious vulture. The civilest, methinks, of all nations are those whom we account the most barbarous. There is some moderation and good nature in the Toupinambaltons, who eat no men but their enemies : while we, learned, and polite, and Christian Europeans, like so many pikes and sharks, prey upon every thing that we can swallow.’

Are Protestant nations nothing concerned in that humorous, but terrible picture drawn by a late eminent hand ? ‘ He was perfectly astonished (and who would not, if it were the first time he had heard

it?) at the historical account I gave him of our affairs during the last century: protesting it was only a heap of conspiracies, rebellions, murders, massacres; the very worst effects that avarice, faction, hypocrisy, perfidiousness, cruelty, rage, madness, hatred, envy, lust, malice, and ambition could produce.—Even in times of peace, how many innocent and excellent persons, have been condemned to death or banishment, by great ministers practising upon the corruption of judges, and the malice of factions! How many villains have been exalted to the highest places of trust, power, dignity, and profit! By what methods have great numbers in all countries procured titles of honour and vast estates? Perjury, oppression, subordination, fraud, panderism were some of the most excusable. For many owed their greatness to sodomy or incest: others, to the prostituting of their own wives or daughters; others, to the betraying of their country, or their prince: more, to the perverting of justice to destroy the innocent. Well might that keen author add, ‘If a creature, pretending to reason, can be guilty of such enormities, certainly the corruption of that faculty is far worse than brutality itself.’

Now, are Popish nations only concerned in this? Are the Protestant quite clear? Is there no such thing among them, (to take one instance only,) as ‘perverting of justice,’ even in public courts of judicature? Can it not be said in any Protestant country. ‘There is a society of men among us, bred up from their youth in the art of proving, according as they are paid, by words multiplied for the purpose, that white is black; and black is white? For example: if my neighbour has a mind to my cow, he hires a lawyer to prove that he ought to have my cow from me. I must hire another, to defend my right, it being against all rules of law, that a man should speak for himself. In pleading they do not dwell on the merits of the cause, but upon circumstances foreign thereto. For instance: they do not take the shortest method to know, what title my adversary has to my cow: but whether the cow be red or black, her horns long or short; whether the field she graze in be round or square, and the like. After which they adjourn the cause from time to time, and in ten or twenty years time come to an issue. This society likewise has a peculiar cant and jargon of their own, in which all their laws are written. And these they take special care to multiply: whereby they have so confounded truth and falsehood, right and wrong, that it will take twelve years to decide, whether the field left me by my ancestors for six generations, belong to me, or to one three hundred miles off.’

Is it in Popish countries only that it can be said, ‘It does not appear that any one perfection is required toward the procurement of any one station among you: much less, that men are ennobled on account of their virtue; that priests are advanced for their piety or learning, judges for their integrity, senators for the love of their country, or counsellors for their wisdom.’

10. But there is a still greater and more undeniable proof, that the very foundations of all things, civil and religious, are utterly out of course, in the Christian as well as the Heathen world. There is a still more horrid reproach to the Christian name, yea, to the name of

man, to all reason and humanity. There is war in the world ! War between men ! War between Christians ! I mean between those that bear the name of Christ, and profess to *walk as he also walked*. Now who can reconcile war, I will not say to religion, but to any degree of reason or common sense ?

But is there not a cause ? O yes, ‘ The causes of war (as the same writer observes) are innumerable. Some of the chief are these ; the ambition of princes ; or the corruption of their ministers. Difference of opinion , as whether flesh be bread, or bread be flesh ? Whether the juice of the grape be blood or wine ? What is the best colour for a coat, whether black, white, or gray ; and whether it should be long or short ? Whether narrow or wide ? Nor are there any wars so furious as those occasioned by such difference of opinions.

‘ Sometimes two princes make war, to decide which of them shall dispossess a third of his dominions. Sometimes a war is commenced, because another prince is too strong : sometimes because he is too weak. Sometimes our neighbours want the things which we have, or have the things which we want. So both fight, until they take ours, or we take theirs. It is a reason for invading a country, if the people have been wasted by famine; destroyed by pestilence, or embroiled by faction : or to attack our nearest ally, if part of his land would make our dominions more round and compact.

‘ Another cause of making war is this. A crew are driven by a storm they know not whither ; at length they make land and go ashore, they are entertained with kindness. They give the country a new name ; set up a stone or rotten plank for a memorial ; murder a dozen of the natives, and bring away a couple by force. Here commences a new *right of dominion* ; ships are sent, and the natives driven out or destroyed. And this is done to civilize and convert a barbarous and idolatrous people.’

But whatever be the cause, let us calmly and impartially consider the thing itself. Here are forty thousand men gathered together on this plain. What are they going to do ? See ! there are thirty or forty thousand more at a little distance. And these are going to shoot them through the head or body, to stab them, or split their sculls, and send most of their souls into everlasting fire, as fast as possibly they can. Why so, what harm have they done to them ? O none at all. They do not so much as know them. But a man, who is king of France, has a quarrel with another man, who is king of England. So these Frenchmen are to kill as many of these Englishmen as they can, to prove the king of France is in the right. Now what an argument is this ! What a method of proof ! What an amazing way of deciding controversies ! What must mankind be, before such a thing as war could ever be known, or thought of upon earth ! How shocking, how inconceivable a want must there have been of common understanding, as well as common humanity, before any two governors, or any two nations in the universe, could once think of such a method of decision ! If then all nations, Pagan, Mahometan, and Christian, do in fact make this their last resort : what farther

proof do we need of the utter degeneracy of all nations, from the plainest principles of reason and virtue? Of the absolute want both of common sense and common humanity, which runs through the whole race of mankind?

In how just and strong a light is this placed by the writer cited before! 'I gave him a description of cannons, muskets, pistols, swords, bayonets; of sieges, attacks, mines, countermines, bombardments; of engagements by sea and land; ships sunk with a thousand men, twenty thousand killed on each side, dying groans, limbs flying in the air; smoke, noise, trampling to death under horses' feet, flight, pursuit, victory; fields strewed with carcasses left for food to dogs and beasts of prey; and farther, of plundering, stripping, ravishing, burning, and destroying. I assured him, I had seen a hundred enemies blown up at once in a siege, and as many in a ship, and beheld the dead bodies drop down in pieces from the clouds, to the great diversion of the spectators.'

Is it not astonishing, beyond all expression, that this is the naked truth! That within a short term of years, this has been the real case, in almost every part of even the Christian world! And meanwhile we gravely talk of the *Dignity of our Nature*, in its present state! This is really surprising, and might easily drive even a well-tempered man to say, 'One might bear with men, if they would be content with those vices and follies to which nature has entitled them. I am not provoked at the sight of a pickpocket, a gamester, a politician, a suborner, a traitor, or the like. This is all according to the natural course of things. But when I behold a lump of deformity and diseases, both in body and mind, smitten with pride, it breaks all the measures of my patience. Neither shall I ever be able to comprehend, how such an animal and such a vice can tally together.'

And surely all our declamations on the strength of human reason, and the eminence of our virtues, are no more than the cant and jargon of pride and ignorance, so long as there is such a thing as war in the world. Men in general can never be allowed to be reasonable creatures, till they know not war any more. So long as this monster stalks uncontrolled, where is reason, virtue, humanity? They are utterly excluded; they have no place; they are a name and nothing more. If even a heathen were to give an account of an age, wherein reason and virtue reigned, he would allow no war to have place therein. So Ovid of the golden age.

*Nondum precipites cingebant oppida fossæ:
Non-galeæ, non ensis erat. Sine militis usu
Mollia securæ peragebant otia gentes.*

Steep ditches did not then the towns surround,
Nor glitt'ring helm, nor slaught'ring sword was found.
Nor arms had they to wield, nor wars to wage,
But peace and safety crown'd the blissful age.

11. How far is the world at present from this state! Yet when we speak of the folly and wickedness of mankind, may we not except our own country, Great Britain and Ireland? In these we have such advantages for improvement, both in knowledge and virtue, as

scarcely any other nation enjoys. We are under an excellent constitution, which secures both our religious and civil liberty. We have religion taught in its primitive purity, its genuine, native simplicity. And how it prospers among us, we may know with great ease and certainty. For we depend not on hearsay, on the report of others, or on subtle and uncertain reasonings, but may see every thing with our own eyes, and hear it with our own ears. Well then, to make all the allowance possible, we will suppose mankind in general to be on a level, with regard to knowledge and virtue, even with the inhabitants of our fortunate islands: and take our measure of them, from the present undeniable state of our own countrymen.

In order to take a thorough survey of these, let us begin with the lowest, and proceed upward. The bulk of the natives of Ireland are to be found in or near their little cabins throughout the kingdom, most of which are their own workmanship, consisting of four earthen walls, covered with straw or sods, with one opening in the side-wall, which serves at once for door, window, and chimney. Here in one room are the cow and pig, the woman with her children, and the master of the family. Now what knowledge have these rational animals? They know to plant and boil their potatoes, to milk their cow, and to put their clothes on and off, if they have any besides a blanket. But other knowledge they have none, unless in religion. And how much do they know of this? A little more than the Hottentots, and not much. They know the names of God, and Christ, and the Virgin Mary. They know a little of St. Patrick, the pope, and the priest: how to tell their beads, to say *Ave Maria* and *Pater Noster*: to do what penance they are bid, to hear mass, confess, and pay so much *for the pardon of their sins*. But as to the nature of religion, the life of God in the soul, they know no more (I will not say, than the priest, but) than the beasts of the field.

And how very little above these are the numerous inhabitants of the northern parts of Scotland, or of the islands which lie either on the west or the north side of that kingdom! What knowledge have these? And what religion? Their religion usually lies in a single point, in implicitly believing the head of their clan, and implicitly doing what he bids.* Meantime they are, one and all, as ignorant of rational, scriptural religion as of algebra; and altogether as far from the practice, as from the theory of it.

‘But it is not so in England. The very lowest of the people are here better instructed.’ I should be right glad to find it so: but I doubt a fair trial will show the contrary. I am afraid we may still say, of thousands, myriads of peasants, men, women, and children, throughout our nation,

‘ Wild as the untaught Indian’s brood,
The Christian savages remain;
Strangers, yea, enemies to God,
They make thee spend thy blood in vain.’

* By a late act of parliament, there is a happy alteration made in this particular

The generality of English peasants are not only grossly, stupidly, I had almost said, brutishly ignorant, as to all the arts of this life, but eminently so, with regard to religion and the life to come. Ask a countryman, What is faith? What is repentance? What is holiness? What is true religion? And he is no more able to give you an intelligible answer, than if you were to ask him about the North-East Passage. Is there then any possibility that they should practise what they know nothing of? If religion is not even in their heads, can it be in their hearts or lives? It cannot. Nor is there the least savour thereof, either in their tempers or conversation. Neither in the one nor the other do they rise one jot above the pitch of a Turk or a heathen.

Perhaps it will be said, 'Whatever the clowns in the midland counties are, the people near the sea-coasts are more civilized.' Yes, great numbers of them are, in and near all our ports: many thousands there are civilized by smuggling. The numbers concerned herein upon all our coasts, are far greater than can be imagined. But what reason and what religion have these that trample on all laws, divine and human, by a course of thieving, or receiving stolen goods, of plundering their king and country? I say king and country: seeing whatever is taken from the king, is in effect taken from the country, who are obliged to make up all deficiencies in the royal revenue. These are therefore general robbers. They rob you and me, and every one of their countrymen: seeing had the king his due customs, a great part of our taxes might be spared. A smuggler then, (and in proportion every seller or buyer of uncustomed goods,) is a thief of the first order, a highwayman or pickpocket of the worst sort. Let not any of those prate about reason or religion. It is an amazing instance of human folly, that every government in Europe does not drive these vermin away into lands not inhabited.

We are all indebted to those detachments of the army, which have cleared some of our coasts of these public nuisances. And indeed many of that body have, in several respects, deserved well of their country. Yet can we say of the *soldiery* in general, that they are men of reason and religion? I fear not. Are not the bulk of them void of almost all knowledge, divine and human? And is their virtue more eminent than their knowledge? But I spare them. May God be merciful to them! May he be glorified by their reformation, rather than their destruction!

Is there any more knowledge or virtue in that body of men (some hundreds of thousands) the *English sailors*? Surely not. It is not without cause, that a ship has been called *a floating hell*. What power, what form of religion is to be found in nine out of ten, shall I say? Or ninety-nine out of a hundred, either of our merchantmen or men of war? What do the men in them think or know about religion? What do they practise? Either sailors or marines? I doubt whether any heathen sailors, in any country or age, Greek, Roman, or barbarian, ever came up to ours, for profound ignorance

and barefaced, shameless, and shocking impiety. Add to these, out of our renowned metropolis, the whole brood of porters, draymen, cartmen, hackney-coachmen, and, I am sorry to say, noblemen and gentlemen's footmen, (together making up some thousands,) and you will have such a collection of *knowing* and *pious* Christians as all Europe cannot exceed.

‘But all men are not like these.’ No, it is pity they should. And yet how little better are the retailers of brandy or gin, the inhabitants of blind ale-houses, the oyster-women, fish-wives, and other good creatures about Billingsgate, and the various clans of pedlars and hawkers, that patrol through the streets, or ply in Rag-fair, and other places of public resort. These likewise amount to several thousands, even within the Bills of Mortality. And what knowledge have they? What religion are they of? What morality do they practise?

‘But these have had no advantage of education, many of them scarcely being able to write or read.’ Proceed we then to those who have had these advantages, the *officers of the excise and customs*. Are these, in general, men of reason? Who think with clearness and connexion, and speak pertinently on a given subject? Are they men of religion? Sober, temperate? Fearing God, and working righteousness? Having a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man? How many do you find of this kind among them? Men that fear an oath, that fear perjury more than death? That would die rather than neglect any part of that duty which they have sworn to perform? That would sooner be torn in pieces, than suffer any man, under any pretence, to defraud his majesty of his just right? How many of them will not be deterred from doing their duty, either by fear or favour? Regard no threatenings in the execution of their office, and accept no bribes, called *presents*? These only are wise and honest men. Set down all the rest as having neither religion nor sound reason.

“But surely *tradesmen* have.” Some of them have both: and in an eminent degree. Some of our tradesmen are an honour to the nation. But are the bulk of them so? Are a vast majority of our tradesmen, whether in town or country, I will not say, religious, but honest men? Who shall judge whether they are or not? Perhaps you think St. Paul is too strict. Let us appeal then to Cicero, an honest Heathen. Now, when he is laying down rules of honesty between man and man he proposes two cases.

1. Antisthenes brings a ship-load of corn to Rhodes, at a time of great scarcity. The Rhodians flock about him to buy. He knows that five other ships laden with corn will be there to-morrow. Ought he to tell the Rhodians this, before he sells his own corn? Undoubtedly he ought, says the Heathen. Otherwise he makes a gain of their ignorance, and so is no better than a thief or a robber.

2. A Roman nobleman comes to a gentleman to buy his house, who tells him, “There is another going to be built near it, which will darken the windows,” and on that account makes a deduction in

the price. Some years after, the gentleman buys it of him again. Afterward he sues the nobleman for selling it without telling him first, that houses were built near, which darkened the windows. The nobleman pleads, "I thought he knew it." The judge asks, Did you tell him or not? And on his owning, he did not, determines. "This is contrary to the law, *Ne quid dolo malo fiat*," (let nothing be done fraudulently,) and sentences him immediately to pay back part of the price.

Now, how many of our *tradesmen* come up to the Heathen standard of honesty? Who is clear of *Dolus malus*? Such fraud as the Roman judge would immediately have condemned? Which of our countrymen would not have sold his corn or other wares at the highest price he could? Who would have sunk his own market, by telling his customers there would be plenty the next day? Perhaps scarcely one in twenty. That one the Heathen would have allowed to be an honest man. And every one of the rest, according to his sentence, is, "no better than a thief or a robber."

I must acknowledge, I once believed the body of *English merchants* to be men of the strictest honesty and honour. But I have lately had more experience. Whoever wrongs the widow and fatherless, knows not what honour or honesty means. And how very few are there that will scruple this! I could relate many flagrant instances. But let one suffice. A merchant dies in the full course of a very extensive business. Another agrees with his widow, that provided she will recommend him to her late husband's correspondents, he will allow her yearly such a proportion of the profits of the trade. She does so, and articles are drawn, which she lodges with an eminent man. This eminent man positively refuses to give them back to her; but gives them to the other merchant, and so leaves her entirely at his mercy. The consequence is, the other says, there is no profit at all. So he does not give her a groat. Now where is the honesty or honour, either of him who made the agreement, or of him who gave back the articles to him?

That there is honour, nay, and honesty to be found in another body of men, among the gentlemen of the *Law*, I firmly believe, whether *Attorneys*, *Solicitors*, or *Counsellors*. But are they not thinly spread? Do the generality of *Attorneys*, and *Solicitors* in Chancery, love their neighbour as themselves? And do to others, what (if the circumstance were changed) they would have others do to them? Do the generality of *Counsellors* walk by this rule? And by the rules of justice, mercy, and truth? Do they use their utmost endeavours, do they take all the care which the nature of the thing will allow, to be assured that a cause is just and good before they undertake to defend it? Do they never knowingly defend a bad cause, and so make themselves accomplices in wrong and oppression? Do they never deliver the poor *into* the hand of his oppressor, and see that such as are in necessity have not right? Are they not often the means of withholding bread from the hungry, and raiment from the naked? Even when it is their own, when they

have a clear right thereto, by the law both of God and man ? Is not this effectually done in many cases, by protracting the suit from year to year ? I have known a friendly bill preferred in Chancery, by the consent of all parties ; the manager assuring them, a decree would be procured in two or three months. But although several years are now elapsed, they can see no land yet. Nor do I know, that we are a jot nearer the conclusion than we were the first day. Now where is the honesty of this ? Is it not picking of pockets, and no better ? A lawyer who does not finish his client's suit, as soon as it can be done, I cannot allow to have more honesty (though he has more prudence) than if he robbed him on the high-way.

“ But whether lawyers are, or not, sure the Nobility and Gentry are all men of reason and religion.” If you think they are all men of religion, you think very differently from your Master, who made no exception of time or nation, when he uttered that weighty sentence, “ How difficultly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven !” And when some who seem to be of your judgment were greatly astonished at his saying, instead of retracting or softening it, he adds, “ Verily, I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.” You think differently from St. Paul, who declares, in those remarkable words, verified in all ages, “ Not many rich men, not many noble are called :” and obey the heavenly calling. So many snares surround them, that it is the greatest of all miracles, if any of them have any religion at all. And if you think they are all men of sound reason, you do not judge by fact and experience. Much money does not imply much sense ; neither does a good estate infer a good understanding. As a gay coat may cover a bad heart, so a fair periuke may adorn a weak head. Nay, a critical judge of human nature, avers that this is generally the case. He lays it down as a rule

*Sensus communis in illa
Fortuna rarus.*

‘ Common sense is rarely found in men of fortune.’ ‘ A rich man, says he, ‘ has liberty to be a fool. His fortune will bear him out.’ *Stultitiam patiuntur opes : But Tibi parvula res est.* ‘ You have little money, and therefore should have common sense.’

I would not willingly say any thing concerning those whom the providence of God has allotted for *guides* to others. There are many thousands of these in the Established Church : many, among dissenters of all denominations. We may add, some thousands of Romish priests, scattered through England, and swarming in Ireland. Of these therefore I would only ask, ‘ Are they all moved by the Holy Ghost, to take upon them that office and ministry ?’ If not, they do not “ enter by the door into the sheep-fold ;” they are not sent of God. Is their eye *single* ? Is it their sole intention in all their ministrations, to glorify God and save souls ? Otherwise.

“the light which is in them is darkness.” And if it be, “how great is that darkness!” Is their “heart right with God?” Are their “affections set on things above, not on things of the earth?” Else how will they themselves go one step in the way, wherein they are to guide others? Once more, “Are they holy in all manner of conversation, as he who hath called them is holy?” If not, with what face can they say to the flock, “Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ?”

12. We have now taken a cursory view of the present state of mankind in all parts of the habitable world, and seen in a general way what is their real condition, both with regard to knowledge and virtue. But because this is not so pleasing a picture as human pride is accustomed to draw: and because those who are prepossessed with high notions of their own beauty, will not easily believe, that it is taken from the life; I shall endeavour to place it in another view, that it may be certainly known whether it resembles the original. I shall desire every one who is willing to know mankind, to begin his inquiry at home. First, let him survey himself; and then go on step by step among his neighbours.

I ask then, first, Are you thoroughly pleased with yourself? Say you, who is not? Nay, I say, who is? Do you never think too well of yourself? Think yourself wiser, better, and stronger than you appear to be upon the proof? Is not this pride? And do you approve of pride? Were you never angry without a cause? Or farther than that cause required? Are you not apt to be so? Do you approve of this? Do not you frequently resolve against it? And do not you break those resolutions again and again? Can you help breaking them? If so, why do you not? Are not you prone to *unreasonable desires*, either of pleasure, praise, or money? Do not you catch yourself desiring things not worth a desire: and other things more than they deserve? Are all your desires proportioned to the real, intrinsic value of things? Do not you know and feel the contrary? Are not you continually liable to “foolish and hurtful desires?” And do you not frequently relapse into them; knowing them to be such: knowing that they have before “pierced you through with many sorrows?” Have you not often resolved against these desires? And as often broke your resolutions? Can you help breaking them? Do so: help it if you can: and if not, own your helplessness.

Are you thoroughly pleased with your own life? *Nihilne vides quod nolis?* Do you observe nothing there which you dislike? I presume you are not too severe a judge here. Nevertheless I ask, Are you quite satisfied, from day to day, with all you say or do? Do you say nothing, which you afterwards wish you had not said? Do nothing, which you wish you had not done? Do you never speak any thing contrary to truth or love? Is that right? Let your own conscience determine. Do you never do any thing contrary to justice or mercy? Is that well done? You know it is not. Why then do you not amend? *Moves, sed nil promoves.* You resolve and resolve, and do just as you did before.

Your *wife* however is wiser and better than you. Nay, perhaps you do not think so. Possibly you said once,

‘Thou hast no faults, or I no faults can spy ;
Thou art all beauty, or all blindness !’

But you do not say so now : she is not without faults : and you can see them plain enough. You see more faults than you desire, both in her temper and behaviour. And yet you cannot mend them : and she either cannot or will not. And she says the very same of *you*. Do your parents or her’s live with you ? And do not they too exercise your patience ? Is there nothing in their temper or behaviour that gives you pain ? Nothing which you wish to have altered ? Are you a parent yourself ? Parents in general are not apt to think meanly of their own dear offspring. And probably at sometimes you admire your’s more than enough : you think there are none such. But do you think so, upon cool reflection ? Is the behaviour of all your *children*, of most, of any.of them, just such as you would desire ? Toward yourself, toward each other, and toward all men ? Are their tempers just such as you would wish, loving, modest, mild, and teachable ? Do you observe no self-will, no passion, no stubbornness, no ill-nature, or surliness among them ? Did you not observe more or less of these in every one of them, before they were two years old ? And have not those seeds ever since grown up with them, till they have brought forth a plentiful harvest ?

Your *servants* or *prentices* are probably older than your children. And are they wiser and better ? Of all those who have succeeded each other for twenty years, how many of them did their work ‘unto the Lord, not as pleasing man but God ?’ How many did the same work, and in as exact a manner, behind your back as before your face ? They that did not were knaves ; they had no religion ; they had no morality. Which of them studied *your* interest in all things, just as if it had been his own ? I am afraid, as long as you have lived in the world, you have seen few of these black swans yet.

Have you had better success with the *journeymen* and *labourers*, whom you occasionally employ ? Will they do the same work if you are at a distance, which they do while you are standing by ? Can you depend upon their using you, as they would you should use them ? And will they do this, not so much for gain, as for conscience’ sake ? Can you trust them as to the price of their labour ? Will they never charge more than it is fairly worth ? If you have found a set of such workmen, pray do not conceal so valuable a treasure ; but immediately advertise the men, and their places of abode, for the common benefit of your countrymen.

Happy you who have such as these about your house ! And are your *neighbours* as honest and loving as they ? They who live either in the same, or in the next house : do these love you as themselves ? And do to *you* in every point, as they would have you do to *them* ? Are they guilty of no untrue or unkind sayings, no unfriendly actions towards you ? And are they (as far as you see or know) in all

other respects, reasonable and religious men ? How many of your neighbours answer this character ? Would it require a large house to contain them ?

But you have intercourse not with the next neighbours only, but with several *tradesmen*. And all very honest : are they not ? You may easily make a trial. Send a child or a countryman to one of their shops. If the shopkeeper is an honest man, he will take no advantage of the buyer's ignorance. If he does, he is no honester than a thief. And how many tradesmen do you know who would scruple it ?

Go a little farther. Send to the market for what you want. 'What is the lowest price of this ?' 'Five shillings, Sir.' 'Can you take no less ?' 'No, upon my word. It is worth it every penny.' An hour after he sells it for a shilling less. And it is really worth no more. Yet is not this the course (a few persons excepted) in every market throughout the kingdom ? Is it not generally, though not always, cheat that cheat can ? Sell as dear as you can, and buy as cheap ? And what are they who steer by this rule better than a company of *Newgate-birds* ? Shake them all together ; for there is not a grain of honesty among them.

But are not your own *tenants* at least, or your *landlord*, honest men ? You are persuaded they are. Very good : remember then an honest man's word is as good as his bond. You are preparing a receipt or writing for a sum of money, which you are going to pay or lend to this honest man. Writing ! What need of that ? You do not fear he should die soon. You did not once think of it. But you do not care to trust him without it ; that is, you are not sure but he is a mere knave. What, your landlord : Who is a justice of peace ! It may be a judge ; nay, a member of parliament : possibly a peer of the realm ! And cannot you trust this honourable (if not right honourable) man, without a paltry receipt ? I do not ask whether he is a whoremonger, an adulterer, a blasphemer, a proud, a passionate, a revengeful man. This it may be his nearest friends will allow. But do you suspect his honesty too ?

13. Such is the state of the *Protestant Christians* in England. Such their virtue from the least to the greatest, if you take an impartial survey of your parents, children, servants, labourers, neighbours, of tradesmen, gentry, nobility. What then can we expect from Papists ? What from Jews, Mahometans, Heathens ?

And it may be remarked, that this is the plain, glaring, apparent condition of human kind. It strikes the eye of the most careless, inaccurate observer, who does not trouble himself with any more than their outside. Now it is certain the generality of men do not wear their worst side outward. Rather, they study to appear better than they are, and to conceal what they can of their faults. What a figure then would they make, were we able to touch them with Ithuriel's spear ? What a prospect would there be, could we anticipate the transactions of the great day ? Could we "bring to

light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the thoughts and intents of the heart?"

This is the plain, naked fact, without any extenuation on the one hand, or exaggeration on the other. The present state of the moral world is as conspicuous as that of the natural. Ovid said no more concerning both near two thousand years since, than is evidently true at this day. Of the natural world he says, (whether this took place at the fall of man, or about the time of the Deluge,) *Jupiter antiqui contraxit tempora veris,*
Perq; hiemes, aestusq; et inaequales autumnos,
Et breve ver spatiis exegit quatuor annum.

The God of nature, and her sovereign king,
 Shorten'd the primitive, perennial spring :
 The spring gave place, no sooner come than past,
 To summer's heat and winter's chilling blast ;
 And Autumn sick, irregular, and uneven :
 While the sad year through different seasons driven
 Obey'd the stern decree of angry heaven.

And a man may as modestly deny, that spring and summer, autumn and winter, succeed each other, as deny one article of the ensuing account of the moral world.

Irrupit vena pejoris in ævum
Omne nefas : fugere pudor, verumq; fidesq;
In quorum subiere locum fraudesq; doliq;
Insidiaq; et vis, et amor sceleratus habendi ;
 A flood of general wickedness broke in
 At once, and made the iron age begin :
 Virtue and truth forsook the faithless race,
 And fraud and wrong succeeded in their place.
 Deceit and violence, the dire thirst of gold,
 Lust to possess, and rage to have and hold.

What country is there now upon earth, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, be the inhabitants Pagans, Turks, or Christians, concerning which we may not say,

Vivitur ex rapto ; non hospes ab hospite tutus.
Filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos,
. Victoria jacet pietas ; et virgo æxte madentes
Ultima calestum terras astræa reliquit.

They live by rapine. The unwary guest
 Is poison'd at th' inhospitable feast.
 The son, impatient for his father's death,
 Numbers his years, and longs to stop his breath ;
 Extinguish'd all regard for God and man :
 And justice, last of the celestial train,
 Spurns the earth drench'd in blood, and flies to heaven again.

14. Universal misery is at once a consequence and a proof of this universal corruption. Men are unhappy, (how very few are the exceptions !) because they are unholy. *Culpum pena premit comes* Pain accompanies and follows sin. Why is the earth so full of complicated distress ? Because it is full of complicated wickedness. Why are not you happy ? Other circumstances may concur, but the main reason is, because you are not holy. It is impossible in the nature of things, that wickedness can consist with happiness. A Roman Heathen tells the English Heathens, *Nemo malus felix* : no vicious man is happy. And if you are not guilty of any gross o

outward vice, yet you have vicious tempers: and as long as these have power in your heart, true peace has no place. You are proud; you think too highly of yourself. You are passionate; often angry without reason. You are self-willed; you would have your own will, your own way in every thing; that is plainly, you would rule over God and man; you would be the governor of the world. You are daily liable to unreasonable desires: some things you desire that are no way desirable: others which ought to be avoided, yea, abhorred, at least as they are now circumstanced. And can a proud or a passionate man be happy? Oh no: experience shows it impossible. Can a man be happy, who is full of self-will? Not unless he can dethrone the Most High. Can a man of unreasonable desires be happy? Nay, they "pierce him through with many sorrows."

I have not touched upon envy, malice, revenge, covetousness, and other gross vices. Concerning these it is universally agreed, by all thinking men, Christian or Heathen, that a man can no more be happy, while they lodge in his bosom, than if a vulture were gnawing his liver. It is supposed indeed, that a very small part of mankind, only the vilest of men, are liable to these. I know not that: but certainly this is not the case with regard to pride, anger, self-will, foolish desires. Those who are not accounted bad men, are by no means free from these. And this alone (were they liable to no other pain) would prevent the generality of men, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, from ever knowing what happiness means.

15. You think, however, you could bear yourself pretty well; but you have such a husband, or wife, such parents and children as are intolerable! One has such a tongue, the other so perverse a temper! The language of these, the carriage of those, is so provoking! Otherwise you should be happy enough. True, if both you and they were wise and virtuous. Meanwhile, neither the vices of your family, nor your own will suffer you to rest.

Look out of your own doors: "Is there any evil in the city, and *sin* hath not done it?" Is there any misfortune or misery to be named, whereof it is not either the direct or remote occasion? Why is it that the friend or relation for whom you are so tenderly concerned, is involved in so many troubles? Have not you done your part toward making them happy? Yes, but they will not do their own: one has no management, no frugality, or no industry. Another is too fond of pleasure. If he is not what is called scandalously vicious, he loves wine, women, or gaming. And to what does all this amount? He might be happy; but *sin* will not suffer it.

Perhaps you will say, nay, he is not in fault, he is both frugal and diligent. But he has fallen into the hands of those, who have imposed upon his good nature. Very well; but still *sin* is the cause of his misfortunes. Only it is another's, not his own.

If you inquire into the troubles under which your neighbour, your acquaintance, or one you casually talk with, labours, still you will find the far greater part of them arise, from some fault either of the

sufferer or of others. So that still sin is at the root of trouble, and it is unholiness which causes unhappiness.

And this holds as well with regard to families, as with regard to individuals. Many families are miserable through want. They have not the conveniences, if the necessaries of life. Why have they not? Because they will not work: were they diligent, they would want nothing. Or if not idle, they are wasteful: they squander away in a short time, what might have served for many years. Others indeed are diligent and frugal too; but a treacherous friend, or a malicious enemy has ruined them: or they groan under the hand of the oppressor: or the extortioner has entered into their labours. You see then, in all these cases, want (though in various ways) is the effect of sin. But is there no rich man near? None that could relieve these innocent sufferers, without impairing his own fortune? Yes, but he thinks of nothing less. They may rot and perish for him. See, more sin is implied in their suffering.

But is not the family of that rich man himself happy? No; far from it: perhaps farther than his poor neighbours. For they are not content: their "eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor their ear with hearing." Endeavouring to fill their souls with the pleasures of sense and imagination, they are only pouring water into a sieve. Is not this the case with the wealthiest families you know? But it is not the whole case with some of them. There is a debauched, a jealous, or an ill-natured husband: a gaming, passionate, or impetuous wife; an undutiful son, or an imprudent daughter, who banishes happiness from the house. And what is all this, but sin in various shapes, with its sure attendant, misery?

In a town, a corporation, a city, a kingdom, is it not the same thing still? From whence comes the complication of all the miseries incident to human nature, war? "Is it not from the *tempers* which war in the soul?" When nation rises up against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, does it not necessarily imply pride, ambition, coveting what is another's, or envy, or malice, or revenge, on one side; if not on both? Still then sin is the baleful source of affliction. And consequently the flood of miseries, which covers the face of the earth, which overwhelms, not only single persons, but whole families, towns, cities, kingdoms, is a demonstrative proof of the overflowing of ungodliness, in every nation under heaven.

PART II.

The Scriptural Method of accounting for this, defended.

1. 1. THE fact then being undeniable, I would ask, How it is to be accounted for? Will you resolve it into the prevalence of *custom*, and say, "Men are guided more by *example* than reason?" It is true. They run after one another, like a flock of sheep, (as Seneca re-

marked long ago) *Non qua eundum est, sed qua itur* : *Not where they ought to go, but where others go.* But I gain no ground by this : I am equally at a loss to account for this custom. How is it, (seeing men are reasonable creatures, and nothing is so agreeable to reason as virtue,) that the custom of all ages and nations, is not on the side of virtue rather than vice? If you say, This is owing to bad *education*, which propagates ill customs ; I own, education has an amazing force, far beyond what is commonly imagined. I own too, that as bad education is found among Christians, as ever obtained among the Heathens. But I am no nearer still : I am not advanced a hair's breadth toward the conclusion. For how am I to account for the almost universal prevalence of this *bad education*? I want to know when this prevailed first, and how it came to prevail? How came wise and good men, (for such they must have been before *bad education* commenced,) not to train up their children in wisdom and goodness? In the way wherein they had been brought up themselves? They had then no ill precedent before them : How came they to make such a precedent? And how came all the wisdom of after ages, never to correct that precedent? You must suppose it to have been of ancient date. Profane history gives us a large account of universal wickedness, that is, universal *bad education*, for above two thousand years last past. Sacred history adds the account of above two thousand more : in the very beginning of which, (more than four thousand years ago,) “all flesh had corrupted their ways before the Lord!” Or, to speak agreeably to this hypothesis, were very *corruptly educated*. Now how is this to be accounted for, that in so long a tract of time, no one nation under the sun, has been able, by wholesome laws or by any other method, to remove this grievous evil? So that their children being *well educated*, the scale might at length,—turn on the side of reason and virtue?

These are questions which I conceive will not easily be answered, to the satisfaction of any impartial inquirer. But to bring the matter to a short issue. The first parents who educated their children in vice and folly, either were wise and virtuous themselves, or were not. If they were not, their vice did not proceed from education. So the supposition falls to the ground : wickedness was antecedent to bad education. If they were wise and virtuous, it cannot be supposed, but they would teach their children to tread in the same steps. In nowise therefore can we account for the present state of mankind from *example or education*.

2. Let us then have recourse to the Oracles of God. How do they teach us to account for this fact, That “all flesh corrupted their way before God,” even in the *antediluvian* world? That mankind were little, if at all, less corrupt, from the flood to the giving of the law by Moses : that from that time till Christ came, even God's chosen people were a “faithless and stubborn generation,” little better, though certainly not worse than the Heathens who knew not God : that when Christ came, both “Jews and Gentiles were all under sin ; all the world was guilty before God ;” that even after

the gospel had been preached in all nations, still the wise and virtuous were “a little flock :” bearing so small a portion to the bulk of mankind, that it might yet be said, “The whole world lieth in wickedness :” That from that time “the mystery of iniquity” wrought even in the church, till the Christians were little better than the Heathens : And, lastly, That at this day “the whole world,” whether Pagan, Mahometan, or nominally Christian, (little indeed is the flock which is to be excepted !) again ‘lieth in wickedness ;’ doth not “know the only true God ;” doth not love, doth not worship him as God ; hath not “the mind which was in Christ,” neither “walketh as he walked ;” doth not practise justice, mercy, and truth, nor do to others as they would others should do to them : How, I say, do the Oracles of God teach us to account for this plain fact ?

3. They teach us, That “in Adam all die :” That “by the first man came” both natural and spiritual “death :”* That by this “one man sin entered into the world, and death” in consequence of sin : and that from him “death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned.” Rom. v. 12.

But you aver, †That “no evil but *temporal death* came upon men in consequence of Adam’s sin.” And this you endeavour to prove by considering the chief scriptures which are supposed to relate thereto.

The first you mention is Gen. ii. 17, “But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it : For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

On this you observe : “Death was to be the consequence of his disobedience. And the death here threatened can be opposed only to that life God gave Adam when he created him.” (Third Edition, p. 7.) True : but how are you assured, that God, when he created him, did not give him *spiritual* as well as *animal* life ? Now *spiritual death* is opposed to *spiritual life*. And this is more than the *death* of the body.

“But this is pure conjecture, without a solid foundation. For no other life is spoken of before.” Yes there is. *The image of God* is spoken of before. This is not therefore pure conjecture ; but is grounded upon a solid foundation, upon the plain word of God. Allowing then, that “Adam could understand it of no other life than that which he had newly received :” yet would he naturally understand it of *the life of God* in his soul, as well as of *the life of his body*.

In this light therefore the sense of the threatening will stand thus: “Thou shalt surely die ;” as if he had said, “I have (p. 8) formed thee of the dust of the ground, and breathed into thy nostrils the breath of lives,” both of animal and spiritual life ; and in both respects thou art become a living soul. “But if thou eatest of the forbidden tree, thou shalt cease to be a living soul. For I will take from thee” the lives I have given, and thou shalt die spiritually, temporally, eternally.

* 1 Cor. xv. 22, compared with Gen. ii. and iii.

† Dr. Taylor’s Doctrine of Original Sin, Part I. to whom I address myself in what follows. What is quoted from him, generally in his own words, is enclosed in inverted commas “ ”.

But “here is not one word relating to Adam’s posterity. Though it be true, if he had died immediately upon his transgression, all his posterity must have been extinct with him.” It is true: yet “not one word” of it is expressed. Therefore other consequences of his sin may be equally implied, though they are no more expressed than this.

4. The second Scripture you cite is Gen. iii. from the 7th to the 24th verse. (p. 9, 10.)

On this you observe, “Here we have some consequences of our first parents’ sin before God judged them: some appointed by his judicial sentence; and some which happened after that sentence was pronounced.” (p. 11.)

“Immediately upon their transgression, they were seized with shame and fear. Guilt will always be attended with shame. And a state of guilt is often in Scripture expressed by being naked. (Exod. xxxii. 25.) ‘Moses saw that the people were naked; for Aaron had made them naked to their shame among their enemies.’ ‘Certainly, *naked* does not mean *guilty* here; but either stripped of their ornaments, (ch. xxxiii. 5, 6,) or of their swords, or their upper garments. (Isa. xlvi. 3.) ‘Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen.’ Here also nakedness does not mean guilt: but is to be taken literally, as manifestly appears from the words immediately preceding. (ver. 2.) ‘Make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers.’ And (Rev. xvi. 15,) ‘Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked and they see his shame.’ The plain meaning is, lest he lose the graces he has received, and so be ashamed before men and angels.

“Their fear is described. (ver. 8.) ‘Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden.’ They had no such fear while they were innocent: but now they were afraid to stand before their judge.” (p. 13.)

This is all you can discern in the Mosaic account as the consequence of our first parent’s sin, *before* God judged them. Mr. Hervey discerns something more: I make no apology for transcribing some of his words.*

‘Adam violated the precept, and as the nervous original expresses it, *died the death*. He before possessed a life incomparably more excellent than that which the beasts enjoy. He possessed a divine life, according to the apostle, *in knowledge, in righteousness, and true holiness*. This, which was the distinguishing glory of his nature, *in the day that he eat the forbidden fruit, was extinct*.

‘His understanding, originally enlightened with wisdom, was clouded with ignorance. His heart, once warmed with heavenly love, became *alienated from God* his maker. His passions and appetites, rational and regular before, shook off the government of

* Theron and Aspasio, Dialogue 11.

order and reason. In a word, the whole moral frame was unhinged, disjointed, broken.

‘The *ignorance* of fallen Adam was palpable. Witness that absurd attempt, to *hide himself* from the eye of *omniscience*, among the trees of the garden. His aversion to the all-gracious God was equally plain. Otherwise he would never have fled from his Maker, but rather have hasted on the wings of *desire*, into the place of the divine manifestation.

‘A strange variety of *disorderly passions* were evidently predominant in his breast. *Pride*; for he refuses to acknowledge his guilt, though he cannot but own the fact. *Ingratitude*; for he obliquely upbraids the Creator with his gift, as though it had been a snare rather than a blessing; “The woman thou *gayest* me.” The female criminal acts the same unhumbed part. She neither takes shame to herself, nor gives glory to God, nor puts up a single petition for pardon.

‘As all these disasters ensued, upon the breach of the commandment, they furnish us with the best key to open the meaning of the penalty annexed. They prove, beyond any argument, That *spiritual death* and all its consequences were comprised in the extent of the threatening.’

5. However, “no other could in justice be punishable for that transgression, which was their own act and deed only.” If no other was justly *punishable*, then no other was *punished* for that transgression. But all were *punished* for that transgression, namely, with death. Therefore, all men were *justly punishable* for it.

By *punishment* I mean *suffering* consequent upon *sin*, or *pain* inflicted because of *sin* preceding. Now it is plain all mankind *suffer* death; and that this *suffering* is consequent upon Adam’s *sin*. Yea, and that this *pain* is inflicted on all men, because of his *sin*. When, therefore, you say, “Death does descend to us, in consequence of his transgression,” (p. 20,) you allow the point we contend for; and are very welcome to add, “Yet it is not a *punishment* for his *sin*.” You allow the thing. Call it by what name you please.

But “*punishment* always connotes *guilt*.” (p. 21) It always connotes *sin* and *suffering*; and here are both. Adam sinned: his posterity suffer: and that, in consequence of his *sin*.

But “*sufferings* are *benefits* to us.” Doubtless, but this does not hinder their being *punishments*. The *pain* I suffer as a *punishment* for my own *sins*, may be a *benefit* to me, but it is a *punishment* nevertheless.

But “as they two only were guilty of the first *sin*, so no other but they two only, could be conscious of it as their *sin*.” (p. 24.) No other could be conscious of it as *their sin*, in the same sense as Adam and Eve were: and yet others may “charge it upon themselves,” in a different sense, so as to judge themselves *children of wrath* on that account.

To sum up this point in Dr. Jenning’s words: ‘If there be any thing in this argument that Adam’s posterity could not be justly pun-

ishable for his transgression, because it was his personal act and not theirs ; it must prove universally that it is unjust to punish the posterity of any man for his personal crimes. And yet most certain it is, that God has in other cases actually punished men's sins on their posterity. Thus the posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, is punished with slavery, for his sin. (Gen. ix. 25—27.) Noah pronounced the curse under a divine afflatus, and God confirmed it by his Providence. So we do in fact suffer for Adam's sin, and that too by the sentence inflicted on our first parents. We suffer death in consequence of their transgression. Therefore we are, in some sense, guilty of their sin. I would ask, What is guilt, but an obligation to suffer punishment for sin ? Now, since we suffer the same penal evil, which God threatened to, and inflicted on Adam for his sin, and since it is allowed we suffer this for Adam's sin, and that by the sentence of God, appointing all men to die, because Adam sinned : is not the consequence evident ? Therefore we are all some way guilty of Adam's sin.*

6. "The consequences appointed by the judicial sentence of God are found in that pronounced on the serpent, or the woman, or the man. (p. 15.) The serpent is cursed. (ver. 14, 15.) And those words in the 15th verse, 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed : He' (so the Hebrew) 'shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel :' imply, that God would appoint his only-begotten Son, to maintain a kingdom in the world opposite to the kingdom of Satan, till he should be born of a woman, and by his doctrine, example, obedience, and death, give the last stroke, by the way of moral means, to the power and works of the Devil." (p. 16.)

I do not understand that expression, "By the way of moral means." What I understand from the whole tenor of Scripture is, that the eternal, almighty Son of God, 'who is over all, God blessed for ever,' having reconciled us to God by his blood, creates us anew by his Spirit, and reigns till he hath destroyed all the works of the Devil.

" Sentence is past upon the woman, (ver. 16,) that she should bring forth children with more pain and hazard, than otherwise she would have done." (p. 17.) How ? With *more pain and hazard* than otherwise she would have done ? Would she otherwise have had any pain at all ? Or have brought forth children with *any hazard* ? Hazard of what ? Certainly not of death. I cannot comprehend this.

" Lastly, the sentence upon the man, (ver. 17, 18, 19,) first affects the earth, and then denounces death upon himself."

" After sentence pronounced, God having clothed Adam and Eve, drove them out of Paradise." (p. 18.)

Here "observe, 1. a curse is pronounced on the serpent and on the ground: but no curse upon the woman and the man." (p. 19.)

But a curse fell upon them in that very moment, wherein they transgressed the law of God. For “cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are *contained* in the law to do them.” Vainly, therefore, do you subjoin, “Though they are subjected to sorrow, labour, and death, these are not inflicted under the notion of a curse.” Surely they are: as the several branches of that curse, which he had already incurred. And which had already not only “darkened and weakened his rational powers,” but disordered his whole soul.

“Observe, 2, here is not one word of any other death, but the dissolution of the body.” Nor was it needful. He felt in himself that *spiritual death*, which is the prelude of *death everlasting*. “But the words, ‘Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,’ restrain this death to this dissolution alone.” (p. 20.) “This dissolution alone” is expressed in those words. But how does it appear, that nothing more is *implied*? The direct contrary appears from your own assertions. For if these words refer clearly to those, ‘And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives:’ and if “the judicial act of condemnation clearly implieth the depriving him of that life which God then breathed into him: it undeniably follows, that this judicial act implieth a deprivation of *spiritual* life as well as *temporal*: seeing God breathed into him both one and the other, in order to his ‘becoming a living soul.’”

It remains, that the death expressed in the original threatening, and implied in the sentence pronounced upon man, includes all evils which could befall his soul and body: death temporal, spiritual, and eternal.

7. You next cite (p. 22,) 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, ‘Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.’ On this you observe, 1. “The apostle is in this chapter proving and explaining the resurrection. It is this fact or event, and no other, which he here affirms and demonstrates.” (p. 23.)

If you mean, “The *resurrection of the body to that life* which it enjoyed in this world, is *the only thing* which the apostle speaks of in this chapter,” your assertion is palpably false. For he speaks therein of *that glorious life* both of soul and body, which is not, cannot be enjoyed in this world.

You observe, 2. “It is undeniable, that all mankind die in Adam, all are mortal, in consequence of his sin.” (p. 24.) 3. “It is equally clear, that by Christ came the resurrection of the dead: that in Christ all who die in Adam, that is, all mankind are made alive.” It is neither clear nor true, that St. Paul affirms this, in either of the texts before us. For in this whole chapter he speaks only of the resurrection of the just, of *them that are Christ's*. (ver. 23.) So that from hence it cannot be inferred at all, that *all mankind* will be *made alive*: admitting then “that *the resurrection of the dead*, and being *made alive*, are expressions of the same signification,” this

proves nothing; since the apostle affirms neither one nor the other, of any but those ‘who are fallen asleep in Christ.’ (ver. 18.) It is of these only that he here asserts, their death came by the first, their resurrection by the second Adam: or, that in Adam they all died; in Christ they all are made alive. Whatever life *they* all lost by means of Adam, *they* all recover by means of Christ.

“From this place we cannot conclude, that any death came upon mankind in consequence of Adam’s sin beside that death from which mankind shall be delivered at the resurrection.” (p. 25.) Nay, from this place we cannot conclude, that mankind in general shall be delivered from any death at all: seeing it does not relate to mankind in general, but wholly and solely to *them that are Christ’s*.

But from this place we may firmly conclude, that more than the mere *death of the body* came even upon these *by man*, by Adam’s sin, seeing the *resurrection* which *comes* to them *by man*, by Christ, is far more than the mere removal of *that death*: therefore their *dying in Adam* implies far more than the bare loss of the bodily life we now enjoy; seeing their *being made alive in Christ* implies far more than a bare recovery of *that life*.

Yet it is true, that whatever *death came on them by one man*, came upon all mankind; and that in the same sense wherein they *died in Adam*, all mankind died likewise. And that all mankind are not *made alive in Christ*, as they are, is not God’s fault, but their own.

I know not, therefore, what you mean by saying, that after Dr. Jenning has proved this whole chapter, and consequently the two verses in question, to relate wholly and solely to the resurrection of the just, “he leaves you in full possession of your argument.” Surely, if he proves this, he wrests your whole argument out of your hands. He leaves you not one shred of it.

8. “We come now, you say, to the most difficult scripture which speaks of this point. Rom. v. 12—19. ‘As by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. For until the law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also is the free-gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift, for the judgment was by one offence unto condemnation, but the free-gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man’s offence death reigned by one, much more they who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free-gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One shall many be made righteous.’”

On this you observe, I. That this passage “speaks of temporal death and no other.” (p. 28.) That it speaks of temporal death is allowed ; but not that it speaks of no other. How prove you this ? Why thus, “ He evidently speaks of that death which ‘entered into the world’ by Adam’s sin: that death which is common to all mankind, which ‘passed upon all men,’ that death which ‘reigned from Adam to Moses ;’ that whereby the many, that is all mankind, are dead.” He does so : but how does it appear, that the death which *entered into the world* by Adam’s *sin*, which is common to *all mankind*, which *passed upon all men*, which *reigned from Adam to Moses*, and whereby the *many*, that is, all mankind, *are dead* : How, I say, does it appear, from any or all of these expressions, that this is *temporal death ONLY*? Just here lies the fallacy. “ No man,” say you, “ can deny, that the Apostle is here speaking of that death.” True : but when you infer, “ therefore he speaks of that *only* :” we deny the consequence.

9. You affirm, II. “ By judgment to condemnation, (ver. 16—18,) he means the being adjudged to the forementioned death: for the condemnation inflicted by the judgment of God, (ver. 16,) is the same thing with being dead.” (ver. 15.) Perhaps so : but that this is merely the *death of the body*, still remains to be proved : as, on the other hand, that “ the gift, or free-gift” opposed thereto, is merely *deliverance from that death*.

You add, “ In all the Scriptures there is recorded but one ‘ judgment to condemnation,’ one sentence, one judicial act of condemnation, which ‘came upon all men.’ ” (p. 29.) Nay, in *this sense* of the word, there is not one : not one *formal sentence*, which was *explicitly* and *judicially* pronounced upon *all mankind*. That which you cite, (Gen. iii. 17. 19,) was not : neither does all that sentence in fact *come upon all men*. *Unto dust shalt thou return*, does come upon all, but the other part does not, ‘ In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.’ This was *formally pronounced*, and actually fulfilled upon Adam : but it is not fulfilled upon all his posterity.

10. You affirm, III. “ These words in the 10th verse, ‘ As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,’ mean the same as those in the 18th, ‘ As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’ ” (p. 30.) Not exactly the same. The being *made sinners* is different from the being *judged, condemned, or punished* as such. You subjoin, “ But these words, ‘ By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation,’ answer in sense to those, (ver. 17,) ‘ By one man’s offence death reigned by one.’ ” (p. 30.) Neither is this exactly true. *Condemnation* came first; and in consequence of this, *death reigned*. You add, “ And by death most certainly is intended no other than *temporal death*.” Most certainly this cannot be proved. Therefore it does not follow, “ That these words, ‘ By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,’ mean no more than, ‘ By one man’s disobedience’ mankind were made subject to temporal death. Review,” you say, “ this reasoning, and see if you can find any flaw in it.” There are several ; but the

grand flaw lies in the very first link of the chain. You have not yet proved, that “death throughout this passage means *only* the death of the body.”

This flaw is not amended by your observing, that St. Paul was a Jew, and wrote to Jews as well as Gentiles: that he often uses Hebrew idioms: and that “the Hebrew word which signifies to be a sinner, in Hiphil, signifies to condemn, or make, (i. e. declare) a man a sinner by a judicial sentence: that you can (by the help of your concordance) produce fifteen Hebrew texts in which the word is so taken!” (p. 31, 32.) For if it would follow from hence, That ‘by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation,’ is just equivalent with, ‘by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners;’ still this does not prove, that the death in question is no other than temporal death.

But indeed it does not follow, that two expressions are just equivalent, because one Hebrew word may contain them both: nor can it therefore be inferred from hence, that *many were made sinners* is just equivalent with *judgment came upon all men to condemnation*. Rather the former expression answers to *all have sinned*, the latter to *death passed upon all men*. *Sin* is the cause of their *condemnation*, and not the same thing with it.

You go on. “Besides all this, it is here expressly affirmed, that the many are made sinners by the disobedience of another man.” It is expressly affirmed; and by an inspired apostle. Therefore I firmly believe it. “But they can be made sinners by the disobedience of another in no other sense than as they are sufferers.” How is this proved? We grant, the Hebrew words for *sin* and *iniquity*, are often used to signify suffering. But this does not prove, that the phrase ‘*were made sinners*,’ signifies only, they *were made sufferers*.

“So Christ was made sin for us.” (p. 35.) No: not so: but as he was *made an offering for sin*. “He suffered on account of the sins of men, and so he was made sin:” yes, a *sin-offering*. But it is never said, he was made a *sinner*: therefore the expressions are not parallel. But he need not have been made sin at all, if we had not been made *sinners* by Adam. “And men suffer on account of Adam’s sin, and so they are made sinners.” Are they made sinners *so only?* That remains to be proved.

“It seems then confirmed beyond all doubt, That ‘by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners,’ meaneth only, by Adam’s sin, the many, that is, all mankind ‘were made subject to death.’” He that will believe it, (taking death in the common sense,) may. But you have not confirmed it by one sound argument.

11. You affirm, IV “The Apostle draws a comparison between Adam and Christ, between what Adam did, with the consequences of it, and what Christ did, with the consequences of that. And this comparison is the main thing he has in view.” (p. 36.)

This is true. “The comparison begins at the 12th verse. ‘Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.’ There he stops awhile, and brings an argument to prove,

That death came on mankind through Adam's transgression." (p. 37, 38.) He does so: but not before he had finished his sentence, which literally runs thus: 'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, even so death passed upon all men, in that all had sinned.' The comparison, therefore, between Adam and Christ, begins not at the 12th, but the 14th verse. Of this you seem sensible yourself; when you say, "Adam is the pattern of him that was to come. Here a new thought starts into the Apostle's mind." (p. 39.) For it was not a new thought, starting into his mind here, if it was the same which he began to express at the 12th verse.

You proceed, "The extent of the free-gift in Christ answers to the extent of the consequences of Adam's sin; nay, abounds far beyond them. This he incidentally handles, (ver. 15, 16, 17.) and then resumes his main design, (ver. 18, 19,) half of which he had executed in the 12th verse." Not one jot of it. That verse is a complete sentence, not half of one only. And the particle *therefore* prefixed to the 18th verse, shows that the discourse goes straight forward: and that this, as well as the 19th verse, are closely connected with the 17th.

Allowing then, "That the Apostle draws a comparison between the disobedience of Adam, by which all men are brought under condemnation, and the obedience of Christ, by which all men are, (in some sense,) justified unto life;" (p. 40.) still it does not appear, either that this *condemnation* means no more than the *death of the body*, or that this *justification* means no more than the *resurrection of the body*.

12. You affirm, V. "The whole of the apostle's argument stands upon these two principles, that by the offence of one death passed upon all men; and by the obedience of one, all are justified."

This is allowed. But I cannot allow your interpretation of *sin is not imputed, when there is no law*, or (as you would oddly, and contrary to all precedent, translate it, *where law is not in being*.) "The sins of mankind," say you, "were not imputed, were not taxed with the forfeiture of life, because the law which subjects the transgressor to death, was not then in being. For it was abrogated upon Adam's transgression, and was not again in force till revived by Moses." (p. 41.) On this I would ask, 1. Where is it written, that "the law which subjected the transgressor to death, was abrogated by Adam's transgression?" I want a clear text for this. 2. Suppose it was, how does it appear, that it was not again in force till *revived by Moses*? 3. Did not that law, 'whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed,' "subject the transgressor to death?" And was it "not in force" after Adam's transgression and before Moses? 4. What do you mean by that ambiguous expression, "Were not taxed with the forfeiture of life?" Your argument requires that it should mean, "*Were not punished or punishable with death.*" But is this true? Were not the sins of the men of Sodom, and indeed the whole antediluvian world, punished with

death, during that period ? 5. Was not every wilful, impenitent transgressor, during this whole time, subject to death everlasting ?

Neither can I allow that unnatural interpretation of ‘them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression’ “had not sinned against law, making death the penalty of their sin, as Adam did.” (p. 42.). Do not the words obviously mean, “*Had not sinned* by any actual sin, as Adam did?”

Nay, “the Sodomites and Antediluvians are no objection to this.” That is strange indeed ! But how so ? “Because extraordinary interpositions come under no rule, but the will of God.” What is that to the purpose ? Their sins are actually punished with death, “during that space, wherein” you say “mankind were not subject to death for their transgressions.” They *were* subject to death for their transgressions; as God demonstrated by those *extraordinary interpositions*.

You add, “That law, ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed,’ makes death the penalty of murder.” (p. 43.) It does, and thereby overthrows your whole assertion. “No, for, 1. It was not enacted till the year of the world 1657.” Well, and if it had been enacted only the year before Moses was born, it would still have destroyed your argument. But, 2. “It is given as a rule for magistrates in executing justice, and not as a declaration of the penalty of sin to be inflicted by God himself.” What then ? What does it matter, whether the penalty annexed by God, were inflicted by God or man ? However, I suppose, this punishment on the Antediluvians, and on Sodom and Gomorrah, was “inflicted by God himself.” But, 3. “None of these were made mortal by those sins.” Certainly, infallibly true ! And yet the case of any of these abundantly proves, that the law was in force from Adam to Moses, even according to your own definition of it, “a rule of duty, with the penalty of death annexed, as due to the transgressor from God.”

13. You affirm, VI. “The consequences of Adam’s sin, answer those of Christ’s obedience ; but not exactly, ‘Not as the offence, so is the free-gift. - For if through the offence of one many be dead, **MUCH MORE** the grace (or favour) of God and the gift (the benefits that are) by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath **ABOUNDED** unto many.’ ver. 15. (p. 43, 44.) That is, he hath in Christ bestowed benefits upon mankind, far exceeding the consequences of Adam’s sin ; in erecting a new dispensation, furnished with a glorious fund of light and truth, means and motives.” This is true : but how small a part of the truth ? What a poor, low account of the Christian dispensation ?

You go on. (ver. 16.) ‘Not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift ; for the judgment was by one offence to condemnation ; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.’ “That is, The grace of God in Christ discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam’s one offence.” Does it entirely discharge them from these consequences ? From sorrow, and labour, and death ? Which you affirmed, awhile ago, to be the *only* consequences of it that affect

his posterity. It "also sets them quite to rights with God, both as to a conformity to the law and eternal life."

Is not this allowing too much: is it well consistent with what you said before? In the 19th verse the apostle concludes the whole argument: 'As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' " (p. 29, &c.) Were *made sinners* you aver means only, were *made mortal*. If so, the counterpart, *made righteous*, can only mean, *made immortal*. And that you thought so then, appears from your citing as a parallel text, 'In Christ shall all be made alive:' which you had before asserted to mean only, shall be *raised from the dead*.

14. "Hence it followeth, 1. That the **ABOUNDING** of God's grace, and the blessings by that grace, doth not respect the consequences of Adam's sin, hath no reference to his transgression, but to the grace of God and the obedience of Christ." (p. 45.) "The **ABOUNDING** of God's grace," you inform us, "has reference to the grace of God." Most sure. But this does not prove, that it has *no reference* to the consequences of Adam's sin. If we gain more blessings by Christ than we lost by Adam, it is doubtless *abounding grace*. But still it has a reference to Adam's transgression, and the consequences of it. It is over these that it abounds. Therefore it has a manifest *respect* to them.

"It followeth, secondly, That in the 18th and 19th verses the apostle considers the effects of Christ's obedience only so far as they answer to and reverse the consequences of Adam's disobedience; the additional benefits flowing therefrom having been mentioned apart in the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses." (p. 47.) In those verses the apostle does undoubtedly show, how the blessing by Christ *abounded* over the curse by Adam. But what then? How does this prove, that the 18th and 19th verses do not respect all the benefits mentioned before? Without question they do: they are a general conclusion, not from one, but all the preceding verses.

"Again observe, That the justification to life is such a justification as comes upon all men." (p. 47.) It *may* in some sense. But *does* it in fact? According to your sense of it, it comes upon none. For if it means, "The discharging men from the consequences of Adam's sin; and if the only consequences of that sin are sorrow, labour and death," it is manifest no man upon earth is *justified* to this day.

But you go on. "As justification to life comes upon all men." No: not in the proper, scriptural, sense of *justification*. That term is never once in the Bible used for the *resurrection*, no more than for heaven or hell.

It may be proper here once for all to observe, that what St. Paul says of *abounding grace* is simply this, 1. The condemnation came by *one offence* only: the acquittal is from *many offences*: 2. They who receive this shall enjoy a far higher blessing by Christ than they lost by Adam. In both these respects the consequences of Christ's death *abound* over the consequences of Adam's sin. And this whole

blessing by Christ is termed in the 18th verse *justification*, in the 19th *being made righteous*.

“ Further, The phrase, *being made righteous*, as well as *being made sinners*, is a Hebrew way of speaking.” (p. 49.) I do not allow that. Both the phrases *καθιστάσθαι δικαῖοις*, or *απαγράψθαι*, are pure and good Greek. That, therefore, there is any Hebraism at all in these expressions, cannot be admitted without proof. If then the same Hebrew word does signify to *make righteous*, and to *acquit in judgment*; it does not follow, that the Greek word, here translated, *made righteous*, means only *being acquitted*. You yourself say the contrary. You but now defined this very *gift*, “ The benefits that are by grace.” (p. 44.) And in explaining those very words, “ The free gift is of many offences unto justification,” affirmed, that is, “ The grace of God in Christ, not only discharges mankind from the consequences of Adam’s sin, but also sets them quite to rights with God, both as to a conformity to the law, and as to eternal life.” And is this no more than “ acquitting them in judgment?” Or “ reversing the sentence of condemnation?”

Through this whole passage it may be observed, that *the gift*, *the free gift*, *the gift by grace*, mean one and the same thing, even the whole benefit given by the *abounding* grace of God, through the obedience of Christ: *abounding* both with regard to the fountain itself, and streams: *abundant* grace producing *abundant* blessings.

If then these verses are “ evidently parallel to those, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22,” it follows even hence, that *dying* and *being made alive*, in the latter passage, do not refer to the body only: but that *dying* implies, all the evils, temporal and spiritual, which are derived from Adam’s sin; and *being made alive*, all the blessings which are derived from Christ, in time and in eternity.

Whereas, therefore, you add, “ It is now evident surely beyond all doubt, (strong expressions!) that the consequences of Adam’s sin here spoken of, are no other than the death which comes upon all men:” (p. 50.) I must beg leave to reply, It is not evident at all; nay, it is tolerably evident on the contrary, that this *death* implies all manner of evils, to which either the body or soul is liable.

15. You next re-consider the 12th verse, which you understand thus: “ ‘ Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,’ namely, in Adam. ‘ All have sinned,’ that is, are subjected to death through that one offence of his.” (p. 51.)

You said before, “ ‘ Death passed upon all men,’ means, all were by a judicial sentence made subject to death.” And here you say, “ ‘ All have sinned,’ means, all have been subjected to death.” So the apostle asserts, “ All were subjected to sin, because all were subjected to death.” Not so. *Sin* is one thing, *death* another; and the former is here assigned as the cause of the latter.

Although the criticism on *φω*, (p. 52.) is liable to much exception, yet I leave that and the Hebrew citations as they stand: because, though they may cause many readers to admire your learning, yet they are not to the point.

“ Seeing then the phrase ‘ all are made sinners’ hath been demonstrated to signify, all are subjected to death by a judicial sentence ; and seeing the apostle’s whole argument turns on this point, that all men die through the one offence of Adam : who can doubt, but all have sinned, means the same with all are made sinners ? ” (p. 53, 54.) I do not doubt it ; but I still deny that either phrase means no more than *all are in a state of suffering.*

16. In order fully to clear this important text, I shall here subjoin some of Dr. Jennings’s remarks.* “ The apostle having treated in the preceding chapter of the cause and manner of a sinner’s justification before God, namely through the merits of Christ, and by faith in his blood ; and having spoken of the fruits of justification in the former part of this chapter : he proceeds in the verses before us, to illustrate our salvation by Christ, by comparing it with our ruin by Adam. He compares Adam with Christ, and shows how what we lost by the one, is restored by the other with abundant advantage. He makes Adam to be a *figure or type* of Christ : considering them both as public persons, representing, the one all his natural descendants, the other all his spiritual seed : the one, Adam, all mankind, who are ‘ all guilty before God : ’ the other, Christ, all those ‘ who obtain the righteousness of God, which is by faith, to all them that believe.’ ”

“ Concerning the consequences of Adam’s sin upon his posterity, we have here the following particulars :

I. “ That by one man sin entered into the world : that the whole world is some way concerned in Adam’s sin. And this indeed is evident, because

II. “ Death, which is the wages of sin, and the very punishment threatened to Adam’s first transgression, ‘ entered by sin, and passed upon all men ; ’ is actually inflicted on all mankind. Upon which it is asserted in the next words,

III. “ That all have sinned : ‘ Even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.’ All men then are deemed sinners in the eye of God, on account of that one sin, of which alone the apostle is here speaking. And

IV “ Not only after, but before, and ‘ until the law,’ (given by Moses,) ‘ sin was in the world ; ’ and men were deemed sinners, and accordingly punished with death, through many generations. Now ‘ sin is not imputed where there is no law ; ’ nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses : plainly showing, that all mankind, during that whole period, had sinned in Adam and so died, in virtue of the death threatened to him. And death could not then be inflicted on mankind for any actual sin, because it was inflicted on so many infants, who had neither eaten of the forbidden fruit, nor committed any actual sin whatever, and therefore ‘ had not sinned’ in any sense, ‘ after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.’ Therefore,

V “ It was ‘ through the offence of one that many are dead.’ (ver

* Vindication of the Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin, page 18 ... 35

15.) ‘By one offence death reigned by one.’ (ver. 17.) And seeing the sin of Adam is thus punished in all men, it follows,

VI. “That they were all involved in that sentence of condemnation, which God passed upon him. ‘The judgment was by one to condemnation.’ (ver. 16.) ‘By one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’ (ver. 18.) And since it is so plain, that all men are actually punished for Adam’s sin, it must needs follow,

VII. “That they *all sinned in Adam*. ‘By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.’ They were so *constituted sinners* by Adam’s sinning as to become liable to the punishment threatened to his transgression.

“Between Adam and Christ, the type and the antitype, St. Paul draws the parallel in the following particulars.

I. “Both have done something by which many others are affected, who either lose or gain by what they did: ‘Through the offence of one many are dead: by one the gift of grace hath abounded to many.’ (ver. 15.)

II. That which the first Adam did, by which many, i. e. all men, receive hurt, was *sin, offence, and disobedience*: they all suffer *by one that sinned*. (ver. 16.) ‘By the offence of one, by one man’s disobedience.’ (ver. 18, 19.) That which the Second Adam did by which many, that is, all who believe, receive benefit, is *righteousness* and *obedience*: ‘By the righteousness of one, by the obedience of one.’ (ver. 18, 19.)

III. “The detriment which all men receive through Adam is, that they ‘are made sinners’: that ‘judgment is come upon them to condemnation;’ in consequence of which, death, the wages of sin, is inflicted on every one of them. The benefit which all believers receive through Christ, is *grace* or the favour of God, justification, *righteousness*, or sanctification, and *eternal life*. ‘The grace of God, and the gift by grace, hath by one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many. By the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men (who receive it) to justification of life. By the obedience of one many are made righteous.’ (ver. 15, 18, 19.)

“Thus the apostle shows the parity between the effects of Adam’s sin, and of Christ’s righteousness. Only in two instances he shows, that the effect of the latter, vastly exceeds the effect of the former.

I. “It removes many sins, besides that one sin of Adam, which so affected all his posterity. ‘If through one offence many be dead, much more the grace of God by Jesus Christ hath abounded to many. The judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.’ (ver. 15, 16.)

II. “Christ raises believers to a far happier state than that which Adam enjoyed in Paradise. ‘Much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life, by one, Jesus Christ.’” (ver. 17.)

17. Your paraphrase on the text, (p. 55—64,) being only a repetition of what you had said over and over before, does not require any separate consideration. Only I must observe a few mistakes

which have not occurred before. “The resurrection is the first and fundamental step in the gospel-salvation.” (p. 61.) No: ‘he shall save his people from their sins;’ this is the first and fundamental step. 2. You have very grievously mistaken the meaning of four texts in the 6th of St. John. ‘This is the Father’s will, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.’ (v. 39.) ‘This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.’ (ver. 40.) ‘No man can come to me, except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day.’ (ver. 44.) ‘Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.’ (v. 54.) Now you cite all these texts as relating to the *general resurrection*: whereas not one of them relates to it at all. They are all, promises made to true believers only; and relate wholly and solely to the *resurrection of the just*.

18. It remains then, all that has been advanced to the contrary notwithstanding, that the true and rational way of accounting for the general wickedness of mankind, in all ages and nations, is pointed out in these words. In Adam *all die*. In and through their first parent, all his posterity died in a spiritual sense: and they remain wholly ‘dead in trespasses and sins,’ till the Second Adam makes them alive. ‘By this ‘one man sin entered into the world and passed upon all men.’ And through the infection which they derive from him, all men are and ever were *by nature entirely* ‘alienated from the life of God, without hope, without God in the world.’

1. Your appendix to the first part of your book is wholly employed in answering two questions. ‘One is, How is it consistent with justice, that all men should die by the disobedience of one man? The other, How shall we account for all men’s rising again, by the obedience of another man, Jesus Christ?’ (p. 65.).

You may determine the former question as you please, since it does not touch the main point in debate. I shall therefore take no farther pains about it, than to make a short extract of what Dr. Jennings speaks on the head. (Vind. p. 36, &c.)

2. ‘As to the first question Dr. Taylor gets rid of all difficulty, that may arise from the consideration of God’s justice, by ascribing it wholly to his goodness, that ‘death passed upon all men. *Death*, he tells us, is *upon the whole a benefit*.’ It is certain, that believers in Christ receive benefit by it. But this gentleman will have death to be an “original benefit, and that to all mankind: merely intended to ‘increase the vanity of all earthly things, and to abate their force to delude us.’” He afterward displays the benefit of shortening human life, to its present standard: that death being nearer to our view might be a powerful motive to regard less the things of a transitory world: but does the *nearer view of death*, in fact produce this effect? Does not the common observation of all ages prove the contrary? Has not covetousness been the peculiar vice of old age? As death is nearer to the view, we plainly see,

that men have more and more regard for the things of a transitory world. We are sure therefore that death is no such benefit to the generality of men. On the contrary, it is the king of terrors to them, the burden of their lives, and bane of their pleasures. To talk therefore of death's being a benefit, an original benefit, and that to all mankind, is to talk against the common sense and experience of the whole world."

"It is strange death should be originally given by God as a benefit to man, and that the shortening of man's life afterwards should be designed as a farther benefit: and yet that God should so often promise his peculiar people long life as the reward of obedience, and threaten them with death as a punishment of disobedience!"

"But the Scripture, he says, affirms, that sufferings are the chastisements, of our heavenly Father, and death in particular. But does not every chastisement suppose a fault? Must he not be a cruel father, who will chasten his children for no fault at all? If then God does but chasten us for Adam's sin, the fault of it must somehow lie upon us. Else we suppose God's dealings with his children to be unreasonable and unrighteous."

3. I would only add two or three obvious questions. 1. Did God propose death as a benefit in the original threatening? 2. Did he represent it as a benefit in the sentence pronounced on Adam, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return?' 3. Do the inspired writers speak of God's 'bringing a flood on the world of the ungodly,' as a *benefit* or a *punishment*? 4. Do they mention the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah as designed for a benefit to them? 5. Is it by way of benefit, that God declares, 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die?' Certainly this point is not defensible. Death is properly not a benefit, but a punishment.

4. The other question is, How shall we account for all men's rising again, by the obedience of another man, Jesus Christ? (p. 70.)

"To set this in a clear light, I ask another question, What was it that gave the glorious personage, emblemized by the Lamb, (Rev. v. 1, &c.) his superior worthiness, his prevailing interest in God, beyond all others in heaven and earth? It was his being slain, that is, his obedience to God, and good-will to men: it was his consummate virtue. 'Thou art worthy—Why? Because thou hast exhibited to God such an instance of virtue, obedience, and goodness. Thou hast sacrificed thy life in the cause of truth, and hast redeemed us, by that act of the highest obedience.' (p. 71, 72.)

With what extreme wariness is this whole paragraph worded! You do not care to say directly, "Jesus Christ is either a little God, or he is no God at all." So you say it indirectly, in a heap of smooth, laboured, decent circumlocutions. Yet permit me to ask, was "that act of obedience, the *original* and *sole* ground" of his prevailing *interest in God*, and of his *worthiness*, not only *to open the book*, but *to receive* from all the armies of heaven, 'the power, and the wisdom, and the riches, and the strength, and the honour, and the glory, and the blessing?' (Rev. v. 12.) And is this *act* the *original* and the *sole*

ground, why *all men* must honour him even as they honour the Father? Yea, and why ‘every creature which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and on the sea, and all that are in them, say, To him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb, is the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the power, for ever and ever!’ (ver. 13.)

‘To him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb:’—Does that mean, to the great God and the little God? If so, when all ‘creatures in heaven and earth,’ all throughout the universe, thus ‘honour him even as they honour the Father,’ are they not doing him too much honour? ‘My glory,’ saith the Lord, ‘I will not give to another.’ How comes it then to be given to *the Lamb*?

5. You proceed, “The worthiness of Christ is his consummate virtue, obedience to God, and benevolence to his creatures.” Is this the *only* ground of his *worthiness* to be *honoured even as the Father*? Is it on this ground *alone*, that ‘all the angels of God are to worship him?’ Or rather, because ‘in the beginning,’ from everlasting, he ‘was with God, and was God.’

“Virtue is the only price which purchaseth every thing with God. True virtue, or the right exercise of reason is true worth, and the only valuable consideration which prevails with God.” (p. 73.)

Do you then conceive this to be the exact meaning of St. Paul, when he says, ‘Ye are bought with a price?’ And that where he speaks of ‘the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood,’ he means, with his *own virtue*? Agreeably to which, ‘Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood,’ must mean, By “the *right exercise of thy reason!*” Well then might father Socinus say, “*Tota redemptionis nostræ per Christum Metaphora, The whole metaphor of our redemption by Christ.*” For on this scheme, there is nothing *real* in it.

“It was not the mere natural power or strength of the Lamb, but his most excellent character.”—Sir, Do you ‘honour the Son, even as you honour the Father?’ If you did, could you possibly talk of him in this strain?

However, all this does not affect the question: but it still remains an unshaken truth, that all men’s *dying* in Adam is the grand cause, why *the whole world lieth in wickedness*.

NEWINGTON, Jan. 18, 1757.

1. In your second part you profess to “examine the principal passages of Scripture, which divines have applied in support of the doctrine of original sin: particularly those cited by the Assembly of Divines in their *larger Catechism*.” (p. 87, 88.) To this I never subscribed: but I think it is in the main, a very excellent composition. Which I shall therefore cheerfully endeavour to defend, so far as I conceive it is grounded on clear Scripture.

But I would first observe in general, with Dr. Jennings, that there are two kinds of texts in the ensuing collection: some that *directly prove*, others that *properly illustrate* the doctrine of original sin. And there are so many, in which it is either directly spoken of, or evidently implied, that the author might well have spared his observation,

“The Scripture speaks very sparingly of the consequences of Adam’s sin upon us, because as these are freely reversed to mankind by Christ, we are not so much concerned to know them.” (p. 30.) The fact here affirmed is equally true with the reason assigned for it.

2. The first proposition in the *Catechism*, which relates to original sin is this :

“The covenant being made with Adam as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned with him, and fell with him in that first transgression.” (p. 91, 92.)

Acts xvii. 26, “God hath made of one blood all nations of men.”

—I believe Dr. Jennings’ remark here will suffice.

“This is quoted to prove, that all mankind descend from Adam. But Dr. Taylor adds, “That is, hath made all the nations of the world of one spirit, endowed with the same faculties.” And so they might have been, if all men had been created singly and separately, just as Adam was: but they could not then, with any propriety of language, have been said to be *of one blood*. This scripture therefore is very pertinently quoted to prove what it is brought for. That ‘Adam was a public person, including all his posterity, and consequently, that all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression,’ the assembly have proved very methodically and substantially: first, from Gen. ii. 16, 17, where death is threatened to Adam in case of his sinning: then from Rom. v. 12—20, and 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, where we are expressly told, that *all men die in Adam*, and that ‘by his offence, judgment is come upon all men to condemnation.’ (Vindication, p. 49, &c.)

Prop. “All mankind sinned in him, and fell with him in that first transgression:” which they prove by Gen. ii. 16, 17, compared with Rom. v. 12. 20, (p. 93, 94.)

On this you remark, “The threatening, ‘Thou shalt surely die,’ is addressed to Adam personally. And therefore nothing can be concluded thence, with regard to Adam’s posterity.” (p. 94.) Is this consequence good? Was not the sentence also grounded on this threatening, “Unto dust thou shalt return,” personally directed to him? And is this nothing to his posterity? Nay, does it not from this very consideration appear, that all his posterity were concerned in that threatening, because they are all partakers of the death which was so threatened to Adam?

“But we cannot gather from Rom. v. or 1 Cor. xv. That all mankind sinned in Adam, if we understand sinned as distinguished from suffering.” It has been largely proved that we can: and that sinning must necessarily be understood there, as distinguished from suffering.

“But the apostle says, The offence of one brought death into the world: whereas had all mankind sinned in Adam when he sinned, then that offence would not have been the offence of one, but of mil-

tions." (p. 95.) It might be, in one sense, the offence of *millions*, and in another, *the offence of one*.

"It is true, Adam's posterity so fell with him in that first transgression, that if the threatening had been immediately executed, he would have had no posterity at all." The threatening ! What was the threatening to them ? Did not you assure us, in the very last page, "The threatening is addressed to Adam personally ; and therefore nothing can be concluded from thence with regard to his posterity?"

And here you say, Their very "existence did certainly fall under the threatening of the law, and into the hands of the judge, to be disposed of as he should think fit !" "As he should think fit !" Then he might, without any injustice, have deprived them of all blessings : of being itself, the only possible ground of all ! And this, for *the sin of another*.

You close the article thus. "We cannot from those passages conclude, that mankind, by Adam's offence, incurred any evil but temporal death." Just the contrary has been shown at large.

3. Their second proposition is, "The fall brought mankind into a state of sin and misery." (p. 96.)

To prove this, they cite, Rom. v. 12, a proof which all the art of man cannot evade : and Rom. iii. 23, 'All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' "But this," you say, "means only, Jews as well as Gentiles, men of all nations have sinned." (p. 97.) Nay, it is most certain, as Dr. Jennings observes, that he "means all men of all nations : or he means nothing to the purpose of his conclusion and his inferences, ver. 19, 20, 21, 22, (Vind. p. 50, &c.) The apostle concludes, from the view he had given before of the universal corruption of mankind, That 'every mouth must be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.' (ver. 19.) From whence he draws two inferences, 1. 'Therefore by the works of the law there shall no flesh be justified.' 2. The only way of justification for all sinners is, 'By faith in Jesus Christ.' 'For there is no difference,' as to the way of justification ; 'for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.' And therefore whoever they are whom Dr. Taylor excludes from this *all*, (*all have sinned*), he must likewise exclude from having any need of justification by Christ."

Be this as it may, it is certain, 1. That mankind are now in a *state of sin and suffering*. 2. That they have been so in all ages, nearly from the time that Adam fell. Now if his fall did not *bring them into* that state, I would be glad to know, what did ?

4. The third proposition is, "Sin is any want of conformity to, or transgression of the law of God, given as a rule to the reasonable creature." "This," you say, "has no immediate relation to our present design." (p. 98.) But it had to their's: which was to illustrate the preceding assertion, "That the fall of Adam brought mankind into a state of sin," in both these senses of the word.

5. Their fourth proposition is, "The sinfulness of that state into which man fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of

his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to evil, and that continually, which is commonly called Original Sin, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions."

On the first article of this you say, "Adam's first sin was attended with consequences which affect all his posterity. But we could not on account of his sin, become obnoxious to punishment." (p. 99.) By *punishment* I mean evil, suffered on account of sin. And are we not obnoxious to any evil, on account of Adam's sin?

To prove the rest of the proposition, they cite first, Rom. iii. 10—20. On which you remark, "The apostle is here speaking of Jews and Gentiles, not in a personal but in a national capacity. The mouth, says he, of all sorts of people, is stopped, and both Jews and Gentiles are brought in guilty; for I have proved, that there are transgressors among the Jews, as well as among the Gentiles." (p. 102.) Not at all. If he proved no more than this, not one person would 'become guilty before God.' Not one *mouth* of *Jew* or *Gentile* would be stopped, by showing, "There were *Jewish* as well as *Heathen* transgressors."

I proceed to your Observations.

"Obs. 1. In this whole section there is not one word of Adam." There is enough in the next chapter but one. The apostle first describes the effect, and afterward points out the cause.

"Obs. 2. He is here speaking, not of all men, but of the Jews; of those alone who were under the law, (ver. 19,) and proving from their own writings, that there were great corruptions, among them as well as other people." (p. 103.)

He is speaking of them chiefly, but not of them only, as appears from the 9th verse, 'We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin: As it is written, there is none righteous,' (neither among the Jews nor Gentiles,) *no, not one*. Does this respect them, in their *national* only, not *personal* capacity? Does it prove no more than, "That there were great corruptions among the Jews, as well as other people?"

"Obs. 3. The section consists of several quotations out of the Old Testament; but, 1. None of them, taken separately, speaks of any depravity of nature, but of habits of wickedness, which men had themselves contracted." (p. 103.) They do speak of habits which men had contracted themselves: but do they speak of these only? The way to know this is, not to "take them separately," not to consider the precise meaning, wherein they were occasionally spoken, by David, Solomon, or Isaiah: but to take them conjointly, as they are here put together by the Holy Ghost, to form the character of all mankind.

On one of them, "separately taken," you say, "How could God look down from heaven, to see if there were any that did seek God, if he knew all mankind were naturally disabled from seeking him?" Why not, if whatever they were *by nature*, *the grace of God* was more

or less given to all? Though they were *wholly inclined to all evil by nature*, yet by grace they might recover all goodness.

You affirm, 2. "In none of these places does God speak strictly of every individual Jew under David or Solomon. Very many were bad; but some were good." (p. 104.) They were; though by grace, not nature. But among all those of whom God speaks by St. Paul, 'there was none good or righteous, no, not one:' every individual, whether Jew or Heathen, was guilty before God.

"I conclude, therefore, 1. That none of those texts refer to any corruption common to all mankind." (p. 106, 107.) Perhaps they do not, as spoken by David; but they do as spoken by St. Paul. "I conclude, 2. Such a general corruption as admits of no exception, was not necessary to the apostle's argument." Absolutely necessary: had it not included *every individual person, no person's mouth* would have been *stopped*.

These texts therefore do "directly and certainly prove," that at the time when the apostle wrote, every individual Jew and Gentile, (except only those who were *saved by grace*), 'were all under sin; That there was none of them righteous, no, not one; none that understood or that sought after God.' This was the fact: and who can find out a more rational way of accounting for this universal wickedness, than by a universal corruption of our nature, derived from our first parent?

6. The next proof is, Eph. ii. 1, 2, 3, 'And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in time past ye walked, according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit, that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath even as others.' (p. 108.)

1. "Nothing is here intimated of any ill effects of Adam's sin upon us." No? Not if we are 'children of wrath by nature'?

2. "The Ephesians were Gentiles converted to the faith." Yea, and Jews also. In this very passage the apostle speaks of both: first, the Gentile, then the Jewish converts.

3. "In these verses he is describing their wretched state, while they were in Gentile darkness."—And while they were in Jewish darkness: the Jews having been just as wicked before their conversion as the Heathens. Both the one and the other had 'walked' till then 'in the vanity of their mind, having their understanding darkened,' being equally 'dead in trespasses and sins,' equally alienated from the life of God, through the blindness of their heart: a very lively description, not so much of a wicked life, as of an evil nature.

4. "When he saith, they were 'dead in trespasses and sins,' he speaks of their personal iniquities." (p. 109.) (True, both of *heart* and *life*. I must make some variation in the rest of your paraphrase.)

Wherein,' saith he, 'in times past ye,' Heathens particularly,

‘walked ;’ inwardly and outwardly, ‘according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now (still) worketh in the children of disobedience : among whom we Jews also had our conversation,’ being as ‘dead in trespasses and sins’ as you.

“Therefore, 5. When he adds, ‘And were by nature the children of wrath even as others,’ he cannot mean, they were liable to wrath, by that nature which they brought into the world.” (p. 110.) Why not ? This does not follow from any thing you have said yet. Let us see how you prove it now. “This nature is no other than God’s own work. The nature of every man comes out of the hands of God.” The same may be said of those who are still ‘dead in trespasses and sins.’ Their *original nature* came from God, and was no other than God’s own work. Yet the *present corruption* of their nature came not from God, and is not his work. “Consequently the nature of every person when brought into being, is just what God sees fit it should be.” This is true of the *original nature* of mankind, when it was first *brought into being*. But it is not true of our *present corrupt nature*. This is not what God sees fit it should be. “It is his power alone that forms it.” Yes, that forms us *men* ; but not, that forms us *sinful men*. “To say the nature HE gives, is the object of his wrath, is little less than blasphemy.” As he gave it, it is not the object of his wrath ; but it is, as it is defiled with sin, “Far was it from the apostle to deprecate our nature.” True, our *original nature*. But never did man more deeply deprecate our *present, corrupt nature*. “His intent is, to show the Ephesians, they were children of wrath, through the sins in which they walked.” Yea, and through ‘the desires of the flesh and the mind,’ mentioned immediately before : ‘through the vanity of their mind,’ through ‘the blindness of their hearts, past feeling, alienated from the life of God.’ Is he “not here speaking of their nature, but of the vicious course of life they had led ?” (p. 111.) “He well understood the worth of the human nature.”—He did, both in its *original*, and in its *present state*.—“And elsewhere shows, it was endowed, even in the Heathens, with light and power sufficient to know God, and obey his will.” In what Heathens, in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, is nature now endowed with this light and power ? I have never found it in any Heathen yet, and I have conversed with many, of various nations. On the contrary, I have found, one and all, deeply ignorant of the very end of their existence. All of them have confirmed what a Heathen *Meeko* (or chief) told me many years ago, “He that sitteth in heaven knoweth *why he made man* : but we know nothing.”

“But St. Paul says, ‘When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, they are a law to themselves.’ (Rom. i. 19. 21.) This supposes, they might have done them by nature, or their natural powers.” But how does it appear, that *by nature*, here means, *by their mere natural powers* ? It is certain, they *had not the written law*. But had they no *supernatural assistance* ? Is it not one God who *works in us and in them, both to*

will and to do? They who by *this help* do the things contained in the law, we grant “are not the objects of God’s wrath.”

“Again, he affirms, the Gentiles had light sufficient to have seen God’s eternal power and godhead.” They had; but how does it appear, that this was the merely *natural* light of their own *unassisted* reason? If they had assistance from God, and did not use it, they were equally *without excuse*. “Nay, if their nature was corrupt, and therefore they did not glorify God, they had a fair excuse.” (p. 112.) True, if God had not offered them grace to balance the corruption of nature. But if he did, they are still *without excuse*: because they might have conquered that corruption, and would not. Therefore we are not “obliged to seek any other sense of the phrase, *by nature*, than *by the nature* we bring into the world.”

However, you think you have found another. “By nature may signify really and truly. Thus St. Paul calls Timothy *γνήτορα τεκνού*, *his own genuine son in the faith*: not to signify he was the child of the apostle, but that he was a real imitator of his faith. In like manner he calls the Ephesians *φυτει τεκνα*, *genuine children of wrath*: not to signify they were related to wrath by their natural birth; but by their sin and disobedience.” (p. 113.)

This is simply begging the question, without so much as a shadow of proof. For the Greek word in one text is not the same, nor any way related to that in the other. Nor is there the least resemblance between the apostle’s calling Timothy ‘his own son in the faith,’ and his affirming that even those who are now ‘saved by grace,’ were ‘by nature children of wrath.’

To add therefore, “Not as they came under condemnation by the offence of Adam,” is only begging the question once more: though it is true, they had afterwards inflamed their account, by “their own trespasses and sins.”

You conclude, “By nature therefore may be a metaphorical expression, and consequently is not intended,” (May be in the premiss, is not in the conclusion! A way of arguing you frequently use) “to signify nature in the proper sense of the word; but to mean, they were really and truly children of wrath.” (p. 114.) But where is the proof? Till this is produced, I must still believe, with the Christian church in all ages, that all men are ‘children of wrath by nature,’ in the plain, proper sense of the word.

7. The next proof is Rom. v. 6, ‘While we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.’ You answer, I “The apostle is here speaking, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only, as appears by the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the epistle.” (p. 115.) From the beginning of the epistle to the 6th verse of the 5th chapter, is the apostle speaking of the *Gentiles only*? Otherwise it cannot appear “by the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the epistle.” “But it appears especially from chap. iii. ver. 9. ‘What then? Are we Jews better than they Gentiles?’ Nay, from that very verse he speaks chiefly

of the Jews. And you yourself a few pages ago, roundly affirmed, "that he there spoke of the Jews only." (p. 102, &c.)

And will you affirm, that in the 4th chapter likewise "he is speaking of the Gentiles only ? Is it not manifest, that he does not speak of them at all, in a considerable part of that chapter ? How then does it appear, by "the whole thread of his discourse from the beginning of the epistle, that he is here speaking not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only?"

However, you boldly go on, "Having established the point, that the Gentiles have as good a title to God's favour as the Jews." (p. 116.)—How ? Is this the only, or the chief point which St. Paul establishes in the fourth chapter ? Is not his main point throughout that chapter to prove, that both Jews and Gentiles were *justified by faith* ? Or, is he "speaking this, not of mankind in general, but of the Gentiles only ?" He proceeds, (chap. v. 1,) 'Therefore being justified by faith, we Gentiles have peace with God.' In the same manner you thrust in the word Gentiles into each of the following verses. Had then the Gentiles only *peace with God* ? You might with more colour have inserted Jews in every verse. For of them *chiefly* the apostle had been speaking. To say that "he principally speaks of and to the Gentiles, to the end of the 6th chapter," (p. 117,) is another assertion which cannot be proved. It is therefore by no means true, that "he is in this verse speaking of the Gentiles, in contradistinction to the Jews."

You affirm, 2. "By the same argument, he here considers the Gentiles only in a body, as distinguished from the body of the Jews. For so he does all along in the four first chapters." No, not in one of them. If he had, the *mouth* of no one individual person had been *stopped*. On the contrary, he speaks both here and all along of every individual, that every one might believe in him, who *died* for every one of the *ungodly*.

You affirm, 3. "In this verse he describes the condition of the converted Gentiles when in their Heathen state, in which they were without strength, unable to recover themselves ; they were ungodly, yea sinners, and enemies to God." (p. 118.) And were not the unconverted Jews also *sinners* and *enemies to God*, *ungodly*, and *without strength* to recover themselves ? These four characters therefore are no proof at all, "that the Gentiles only are here spoken of."

"Their sin, and enmity, and ungodliness, consisted in their wicked works." Primarily in their *wicked tempers*. But how came all men, Jews and Gentiles, to have those wicked *tempers*, and to walk in those wicked *works* ? How came they all, till converted, to be *dead in sin*, and *without strength* to recover from it ? Unless *in Adam all died*, in a deeper sense than you are willing to allow.

You sum up your argument thus : "The apostle is not speaking here of all mankind's being corrupted in Adam, but of the Gentiles being corrupted by the idolatry and wickedness into which they had plunged themselves, and out of which they were unable to recover themselves, without the extraordinary interposal of divine grace." (p. 120.)

If this was the case of the Heathens only, then the Jews were not *without strength*, but were able to recover themselves from their wickedness, without any such interposal. But with regard to the Heathens I ask, 1. Was this the state of all the Heathen nations, or of some only? 2. If of some only, which were they that were not corrupted? 3. If it was the state of all Heathen nations, how came it to be so? How was it, that there was not one uncorrupted nation on earth? 4. How could any Heathen nation be in this state? *Without strength?* *Unable to recover themselves* from sin, without the extraordinary interposal of the divine grace? Since you are clear in this, that “all the Gentiles are endowed with light and power, sufficient to know God, and perform obedience to his will by their natural powers of reason and understanding.” (p. 121.) If you say, “They were once endowed with these powers, but now they had cast them away:” I am not satisfied still. What, did all nations cast away their *natural powers* of reason and understanding? Surely not! But if not, how came they all to plunge themselves into this dreadful corruption?

8. Another proof is, (Rom. viii. 7, 8.) ‘The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.’

On this you observe, 1, “Here is not one word of Adam, or any consequence of his sin upon us.”

The whole passage speaks of that corruption of our nature, which is the consequence of Adam’s sin.

The plain and obvious sense of it is this, (ver. 3,) ‘What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh,’ (too weak to contend with our corrupt nature,) God hath done: ‘sending his own Son, he hath condemned’ that ‘sin’ which was in our ‘flesh:’ hath given sentence that it should be destroyed, (ver. 4,) ‘That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit:’ who are guided in all our thoughts, words, and actions, not by corrupt nature, but by the Spirit of God. (ver. 5.) ‘They that are after the flesh,’ who are still guided by corrupt nature, ‘mind the things of the flesh:’ have their thoughts and affections fixed on such things as gratify corrupt nature: ‘but they that are after the Spirit,’ who are under his guidance, ‘mind the things of the Spirit:’ think of, relish, love the things, which the Spirit hath revealed, which he moves us to, and promises to give us. (ver. 6.) ‘For to be carnally minded,’ to ‘mind the things of the flesh,’ of our corrupt nature, ‘is death:’ the sure mark of spiritual death, and the way to death everlasting. ‘But to be spiritually minded,’ to mind the things of the Spirit, ‘is life:’ the sure mark of spiritual life, and the way to life everlasting; and attended with the *peace* of God, and *peace with* God, which otherwise can have no place: (ver. 7.) ‘Because the carnal mind,’ the mind, taste, inclination, the whole bias of our evil nature ‘is enmity against God. For it is not subject to the law of God, neither

indeed can be :’ being as opposite thereto as hell to heaven. (ver. 8.) ‘So then they that are in the flesh,—still unrenewed by the Spirit, still following the bent of corrupt nature, ‘cannot please God.’ Every man now may see whether this passage does not strongly illustrate the depravity of our nature.

9. The last proof of this part of the proposition, is, (Gen. vi. 5.) ‘God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.’ And below, (ver. 11.) ‘The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.’ (p. 122.)

“Mankind,” you say, “was universally debauched into lust and sensuality, rapine and violence.” And how came this *universal wickedness*, if all mankind were quite upright by nature? You answer, “They had corrupted themselves; so the text, (ver. 12,) ‘All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.’” This expression does not necessarily imply any more, than that *all flesh*, all men, were corrupted. But taking it literally, I ask, How came all flesh to corrupt themselves? Oh, “by Seth’s posterity intermarrying with the Cainites.” But how came all the *Cainites* to corrupt themselves? And all the *Sethites* to follow, not reform them? If the balance was even, if nature leaned neither way, there ought to have been as many good as bad still: and the *Sethites* ought to have reformed as many of the children of Cain, as the *Cainites* corrupted of the children of Seth. How came it then, that *only* ‘Noah was a just man?’ And does one good man amidst a world of the ungodly, prove, that the “nature of mankind in general is not corrupted?” Or rather strongly prove, that it is? It does not prove, that Noah himself was not naturally inclined to evil; but it does, that the world was.

“But if the corruption of nature was the reason why the old world was destroyed, it is a reason for the destruction of the world at any time.” (p. 123.) This *alone* was never supposed to be the reason; but their actual wickedness added thereto.

You add, “It may be urged, that God said, ‘I will not again curse the ground for man’s sake: for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.’ (Gen. viii. 21.) But the *Hebrew* particle ו sometimes signifies *although*.” That does not prove, that it signifies so here. But what if it does? What if the texts be rendered, *Though the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth?* Even thus rendered, it implies as strongly as it did before, that *man’s heart* is naturally inclined to evil.

The *Hebrew* word, translated *youth*, (p. 124,) is always applied to *childhood* or *tender age*, (Isa. vii. 16,) וָיַם signifies *a little child*. And none of the texts you have cited prove the contrary. *Heman*, the author of the 88th *Psalm*, was doubtless *afflicted from his youth* or *childhood*. The *Babylonians* (mentioned xlvi. 12.) may well be supposed to have been trained up in the way of their fathers, from their *earliest childhood*: and the plain meaning of *Jeremiah*, (ch. iii. 24, 25,) ‘Shame hath devoured the labour of our fathers from

our youth.' 'We lie down in our shame; for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers from our youth,' is, Ever since we began to think or act, we have gone astray from God:

10. The preceding texts were brought to prove (and they do abundantly prove it) that our nature is deeply corrupted, inclined to evil, and disinclined to all that is spiritually good, so that without supernatural grace, we can neither will nor do what is pleasing to God. And this easily accounts for the wickedness and misery of mankind, in all ages and nations: whereby experience and reason do so strongly confirm this scriptural doctrine of *Original Sin*.

Yet it will not "follow, That men are not moral agents." (p. 125.) If you ask, "Why, how are they capable of performing duty?" I answer, By grace, though not by nature. And a measure of this is given to all men. Nor does it follow, "That we can by no means help or hinder that sin which is natural to us." Yes, we can. Anger, for instance, is natural to me: yea, irregular, unreasonable anger. I am naturally inclined to this, as I experience every day. Yet *I can help it* by the grace of God; and do so as long as I watch and pray.

Dr. Jennings answers this assertion more at large, "*If sin be natural then it is necessary.*" (p. 125.) If by sin is meant the corrupt bias of our wills, that indeed is natural to us, as our nature is corrupted by the fall: but not as it came originally out of the hand of God. Therefore it is improperly compared to the appetites of hunger and thirst, which might be in our *original nature*. Now this bias of the will is certainly evil and sinful, and hateful to God; whether we have contracted it ourselves, or whether we derive it from Adam, makes no difference. A proud or passionate temper is evil, whether a man has contracted it himself, or derived it from his parents. Therefore the inference, *If natural and* (in some sense) *necessary then no sin*, does by no means hold.

"But if by sin be meant sinful actions, to which this corrupt bias of the will inclines us; it remains to be proved, that a corrupt bias of the will, makes the actions necessary and consequently not sinful. And, indeed, if a corrupt bias makes sin to be necessary, and consequently to be no sin, then the more any man is inclined to sin, the less sin he can commit; and as that corrupt bias grows stronger, his actual sinning becomes more necessary: and so the man instead of growing more wicked grows more innocent." (Vind. p. 68, &c.)

11. That this doctrine has been long "held in the church of Rome," (p. 126.) is true. But so it has in the Greek church also: and so far as we can learn, in every church under heaven, at least from the time that God spake by Moses.

From this infection of our nature, (call it original sin, or what you please,) spring many, if not all, actual sins. And this St. James (i. 14.) plainly intimates, even according to your paraphrase on his

words, “ ‘Every man is tempted,’ is overcome by temptation ‘when he is drawn away by his own lust,’ his own irregular desire ; where the apostle charges the wickedness of men on its proper cause, their own lust.” Very true. And *irregular desire* is (not so much a fruit as a) part of original sin. For to say, “ Eve had irregular desires before she sinned,” (p. 127.) is a contradiction : since all irregular desire is sin.

12. Another proof, that *actual sins* spring from *original* is, (Matt. xv. 19.) ‘Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false-witness, blasphemies.’

“ But what has this text to do with Adam’s sin ? ” It has much to do with the point it is brought to prove : namely, That actual sin proceeds from *original, evil works* from an *evil heart*. Do not therefore triumph over these venerable men (as you have done again and again) because a text cited in proof of one clause of a proposition, does not prove the whole.

But “ neither of those texts proves, that all our wickedness proceeds from our being corrupted by Adam’s sin.” (p. 128.) But they both prove what they were brought to prove, that all outward wickedness proceeds from inward wickedness. Those pious men therefore did not mix “ the forgery of their own imagination with the truth of God.”

But “ if all actual transgressions proceed from Adam’s sin, then he is the only guilty person that ever lived. For if his sin is the cause of all ours, he alone is chargeable with them.”

True : if all our transgression so proceed from his sin, that we cannot possibly avoid them. But this is not the case : by the grace of God, we may ‘cast away all our transgressions.’ Therefore if we do not, they are chargeable on ourselves. We may live : but we will die.

Well, but “ on these principles, all actual sins proceed from Adam’s sin, either by necessary consequence ; or through our own choice ; or partly by one, and partly by the other.” (p. 129.) Yes, partly by one, and partly by the other. We are inclined to evil, antecedently to our own choice. By grace we may conquer this inclination, or we may choose to follow it, and so commit actual sin.

13. Their fifth proposition is, “ Original sin is conveyed from our first parents to their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way, are conceived and born in sin.” (p. 130.)

In proof of this they urge, (Psalm li. 5.) ‘Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.’

On this you observe, “ The word which we translate shapen, signifies to bring forth or bear. So here it means, Behold I was brought forth or born in iniquity.” (p. 131.)

Suppose it does, (which is not plain ; for you cannot infer from its meaning so sometimes, that it means so here,) what have you gained ? If David was *born* in iniquity, it is little different from being *shapen* therein.

That the Hebrew word does not always mean *to be born*, but rather to be *shapen*, *formed*, or *made*, evidently appears from Ps. xc. 2; where it is applied to the formation of the earth. And in this very text, the Seventy render it by ἐπλασθη, a word of the very same import. It is therefore here very properly rendered shapen: nor can it be more exactly translated.

But “the word, וְרָאָה properly signifies *warmed me.*” You should say, *literally* signifies. But it signifies *conceived me*, nevertheless. And so it is taken, Gen. xxx. 38, 39. 41, &c. xxxi. 10. “Nay it signifies there the act of copulation. So several translators render it.” (p. 132, 133.) And several render it otherwise. So this does not determine the point either way.

It must therefore be determined by the sense. Now, for what end did Jacob put the ‘pilled rods before the cattle?’ That the lambs might be marked as the rods were. And when is it that females of any kind mark their young? Not in that act: But some time after, when the foetus is either forming or actually formed. Throw a plumb or a pear at a woman before conception, and it will not mark the foetus at all: but it will, if thrown while she is conceiving, or after she has conceived, as we see in a thousand instances. This observation justifies our translators in rendering the word by *conceiving* in all those places.

And indeed you own, “David could not apply that word to his mother, in the sense wherein you would apply it to the cattle.” You, therefore, affirm, “it means here, *to nurse.*” (p. 134.) You may as well say, it means, *to roast.* You have as much authority from the Bible, for one interpretation as for the other. Produce, if you can, one single text, in which מִנְחָה signifies *to nurse*, or any thing like it.

You stride on. 1. “The verse means, In sin did my mother nurse me: 2. That is, I am a sinner from the womb: 3. That is, I am a great sinner: 4. That is, I have contracted strong habits of sin.” By this art you may make the most expressive texts, mean just any thing or nothing.

“So Psl. lviii. 3, ‘The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, telling lies.’ That is, my unjust persecutors in Saul’s court are exceedingly wicked.” If this was all David meant, what need of יְנִיחָה are alienated? And that from the *bowels* of their mother? Nay, but he means as he speaks. They ‘are alienated from the life of God,’ from the time of their coming into the world. From the time of their birth they ‘know not the way of truth:’ neither can, unless they are ‘born of God.’”

You cite as a parallel text, “‘Thou wast called a transgressor from the womb,’ that is, set to iniquity by prevailing habits and customs.” Nay, the plain meaning is, the Israelites in general had never kept God’s laws since they came into the world.

Perhaps the phrase, *from the womb*, is once used figuratively, namely, Job xxxi. 18. But it is manifest, that it is to be literally taken, Isa. xl ix. 1. ‘The Lord hath called me from the womb, from the bowels

of my mother hath he made mention of my name.' For, 1. This whole passage relates to Christ; these expressions in particular. 2. This was literally fulfilled, when the angel was sent while he was yet in the womb, to order that his *Name* should be *called* JESUS. This is not therefore barely "an hyperbolical form of aggravating sin;" but an humble confession of a deep and weighty truth, whereof we cannot be too sensible.

"But you have no manner of ground to conclude that it relateth to Adam's sin." (p. 136.) Whether it relates to Adam's personal sin or not, it relates to a *corrupt nature*. This is the present question; and your pulling in Adam's sin, only tends to puzzle the reader. But how do you prove (since you *will* drag this in) that it does not relate to Adam's sin?

Thus: "1. In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Adam, or the effects of his sin upon us."

Here, as usual, you blend the two questions together; the ready way to confound an unwary reader. But, first, to the first, "In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Adam. Therefore it relateth not to him." Just as well you may argue, "In the whole Psalm there is not one word about Uriah. Therefore it relateth not to him." The second assertion, "There is not one word of the effects of his sin," is a fair begging the question.

"2. The Psalmist is here charging himself with his own sin." He is; and tracing it up to the fountain.

3. "But according to our version, he does not charge himself with his sin, but some other person. He throws the whole load of sin from off himself on God who shaped him, and his mother who conceived him."

What you say might have had weight, if he had offered this in *excuse* of his sin, or even in extenuation of it. But does he do this? Does he in fact "throw the whole blame, or any part of it from off himself?" Just the reverse. He acknowledges and bewails his *own* total *iniquity*: not to *excuse*, but to abase himself the more before God, for his *inward* as well as *outward* wickedness.

And yet he might, in perfect consistency with, this when God had caused 'the bones which had been broken to rejoice,' cry out, 'I will praise thee, O God: for I am fearfully and wonderfully made:' yea, and repeat all that follows in the same Psalm: which proves so much and no more, that every *fœtus* in the womb is formed by the power and wisdom of God. Yet does it not follow, that the sin transmitted from the parent "must be attributed to God." (p. 137.)

"But how could he with pleasure reflect upon his formation, or praise God for it?" As I can at this day: though I know I was 'conceived in sin,' and 'shapen in iniquity.' But 'where sin abounds, grace does much more abound.' I lose less by Adam than I gain by Christ.

This also perfectly consists with the following verse, 'Behold thou desirest truth,' or it is thy will that we should have truth 'in the in-

ward parts:’ thou art willing to remove all that ‘iniquity wherein I was shapen,’ to ‘give me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me. And in the hidden part thou hast made me to know wisdom:’ thou hast ‘shown me what was good.’ So that I am every way without excuse. I knew thy will and did it not.

“But if after all you will adhere to the literal sense of this text, why do you not adhere to the literal sense of that text, ‘this is my body,’ and believe transubstantiation?” (p. 138.) For those very reasons which you suggest: 1. Because it is grossly absurd to suppose that Christ speaks of what he then held in his hands, as his *real natural body*. But it is no way absurd to suppose the Psalmist was *conceived in sin*. 2. The sense of, *this is my body*, may be clearly explained by other scriptures, where the like forms of speech are used. But there are no other scriptures where the like forms with this of David are used in any other sense. 3. Transubstantiation is attended with consequences hurtful to piety. But the doctrine of Original Sin, and faith grounded thereon, is the only foundation of true piety.

14. The next proof is, Job xiv. 4, “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.” On this you observe, “Job is here speaking of the weakness of our nature, not with regard to sin, but to the shortness and afflictions of life.” (p. 139.) Certainly, with regard both to the one and the other. For though in the first and second verses, he mentions the shortness and troubles of life, yet even these are mentioned with a manifest regard to sin. (p. 140.) This appears from the very next verse, ‘And dost thou open thy eyes upon such a one,’ to punish one already so wretched? ‘And bringest me into judgment with thee,’ by chastising me still more? It then immediately follows, ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one:’ It does therefore by no means appear that “Job is here speaking only with regard to the shortness and troubles of life.”

Part of the following verses run thus: (ver. 16, 17.) ‘Now thou numberest my steps; dost thou not watch over my sin? My transgression is sealed up in a bag, and thou sowest up mine iniquity? Let any one judge then, whether Job in this chapter does not speak of “the sinfulness as well as the mortality of human nature.”

Not that he “urges his natural pravity as a reason why he should not be brought into judgment.” (p. 141.) No more than David urges his being ‘shapen in wickedness,’ as an excuse for that wickedness. Rather Job (as well as David) humbly acknowledges his total sinfulness: confessing, that he *deserved the judgment*, which yet he prays God not to inflict.

15. Another proof is, Job xv. 14. ‘What is man that he should be clean, and he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous?’

On this you observe, “Born of a woman signifies no more than a man.” Often it does not; but here it is emphatical. “The phrase indeed includes frailty and imperfection.” (p. 142.) How can that be? Was Adam made *frail* and *imperfect*? And have you forgot that

every man is now *born* in as good a state as Adam was *made* at first ? “ But it is not to be understood as the reason, why man is unclean and unrighteous.” From the placing of the words one would really judge it was : and how do you prove it is not ? Why “ Job and his friends use this manner of speech, in other places of this book. ‘ Shall mortal man be more just than God ? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker ? ’ ” (Job iv. 17.) Nay, this is not the *manner of speech* which is in question ; so you are here quite wide of the mark. “ However that is, ‘ How can man be justified with God ? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman ? ’ ” (Job xxv. 4.)

And does not this point at original sin ? You say, No. For “ if Job and his friends had known, that the reason of our uncleanness and imperfection was our receiving a corrupted nature from Adam, they ought to have given this reason of it.” And do they not, in the very words before us ? You say, “ No : they turn our thoughts to a quite different reason, namely, the uncleanness of the best of creatures in his sight.” This is not a different reason, but falls in with the other : and the natural meaning of these texts is, ‘ How can he be clean that is born of a woman,’ (Job xxv. 4,) and so conceived and born in sin ? ‘ Behold, even to the moon, and it shineth not,’ compared with God : ‘ yea, the stars are not pure in his sight ! ’ How ‘ much less man that is a worm ? ’ In how much higher and stricter a sense is man impure, that carries about with him his *mortality*, the testimony of that unclean nature which he brought with him into the world ?

‘ Shall mortal man be more just than God ! Shall a man be more pure than his Maker ? ’ (Job iv. 17.) Shall man dare to arraign the justice of God ? To say, God punishes him more than he deserves ? ‘ Behold he puts no trust in his servants, and his angels he charged with folly.’ (Job iv. 18, &c.) Many of these left their first estates ; even their wisdom was not to be depended on. ‘ How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay,’ whose bodies, liable to pain, sickness, death, are standing monuments of the folly and wickedness which are deep rooted in their souls ?

‘ What is man, that he should be clean, and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous ? Behold he putteth no trust in his holy ones ; yea, the heavens, ‘ are not pure in his sight.’ His holy angels have fallen, and the highest creatures are not pure in comparison of him. ‘ How much more abominable and filthy,’ in the strictest sense, is man, every man born into the world ? ‘ Who drinketh iniquity like water,’ (Job xv. 15, 16,) iniquity of every kind, so readily, so naturally, as being so thoroughly agreeable to ‘ the desires of his flesh, and of his mind ? ’

You conclude the head thus, “ Man in his present weak and fleshly state cannot be clean before God.” Certainly, as clean as the moon and stars at least ; if he be as he was first created. He was ‘ made but a little lower than the angels.’ Consequently he was then far higher and more pure, than these, or the sun itself, or any other part of the material creation. You go on, “ Why cannot

a man be clean before God? Because he is conceived and born in sin? No such thing. But because if the purest creatures are not pure in comparison of God, much less a being subject to so many infirmities as a mortal man.” Infirmities! What then? Do *innocent* infirmities make a man *unclean before God*? Do labour, pain, bodily weakness, or mortality, make us *filthy and abominable*? Surely not. Neither could they make a man pure from sin, less pure than the moon and stars. Nor can we conceive Adam as he came out of the hands of God, to have been in any sense *less clean* than these. All these texts therefore must refer to that sinful impurity, which every man brings into the world.

You add, “Which is a demonstration to me, that Job and his friends were wholly strangers to this doctrine.” A demonstration of a peculiar kind! I think neither mathematical nor logical.

16. The last proof is John iii. 6, ‘That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.’ (p. 144.)

* “Here by *flesh* Dr. Taylor understands nothing else, but the mere *parts* and *powers* of a man: and by being *born of the flesh*, the being *born* of a *woman*, with the *constitution* and *natural powers* of a man. Now let us suppose that human nature is not at all corrupted, and let us try what sense we can make of other scriptures, where the word *flesh* is used in opposition to *spirit*, as it is here. Rom. viii. 1, ‘There is no condemnation to them who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;’ that is, not after the pure, uncorrupted constitution and powers of man. Again ver. 8, ‘They that are in the flesh cannot please God;’ that is, they that have the parts and powers of a man. Again, ‘If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die;’ that is, if ye live suitably to the constitution and powers of your nature. Once more: how shall we understand ‘the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh.’ (Gal. v. 17.) If *flesh* means nothing but the pure and uncorrupted powers of human nature?

“But this text, John iii. 3, is, according to Dr. Taylor, so far from implying any corruption of our nature, that “on the contrary it supposes we have a nature susceptible of the best habits, and capable of being born of the spirit.” (p. 145.) And who ever denied it? Who ever supposed, that such a corruption of nature, as for the present disables us for spiritual good, renders us incapable of being *born of the Spirit*?

“But if natural generation is the mean of conveying a sinful nature from our first parents to their posterity, then must itself be a sinful and unlawful thing.” I deny the consequence. You may transmit to your children a nature tainted with sin, and yet commit no sin in so doing.

“Again, we produce one another, only as the oak produces the acorn. The proper production of a child is from God. But if God produces a foetus, which has sinful dispositions, he produces those dispositions:” (p. 146.) Your argument proves too much. It would

prove God to be the author of all *actual* (as well as *original*) sin. For "it is the power of God under certain laws and established rules," which produces not only the *fætus*, but all the *motion* in the universe. It is his power which so violently expands the air, on the discharge of a pistol or cannon. It is the same which produces muscular motion, and the circulation of all the juices in man. But does he therefore produce adultery or murder? Is he the cause of those *sinful motions*? He is the cause of the *motion*; (as he is of the *fætus*,) of the *sin* he is not. Do not say, This is too fine a distinction! Fine as it is, you must necessarily allow it. Otherwise you make God the direct author of all the sin under heaven. To apply this more directly to the point. God does produce the *fœtus* of man, as he does of trees, empowering the one and the other to propagate each after its kind. And a *sinful man* propagates after his kind, another *sinful man*. Yet God produces, in the sense above mentioned, *the man*, but not *the sin*.

17. Their sixth proposition is, "The fall brought upon mankind the loss of communion with God, his displeasure and curse, so as we are by nature children of wrath, bondslaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments, in this world and that which is to come."

In proof of the first clause of this proposition, they cite Gen. iii. 8. 10. 24. On this you observe, "Adam and Eve by their sin did forfeit communion with God. But God did not take the forfeiture." (p. 147.) Surely he did, when 'they were afraid and hid themselves from his presence.' "But afterward they had frequent communion with him." This does not prove, they did not lose it before.

"But their posterity did not. Abel had communion with him, and so had the patriarchs and prophets. And so have we at this day. So that, as we could not justly have lost this communion by Adam's sin, it is true, in fact, that we have not lost it. We still have 'fellowship with the Father and Son.' (p. 148.)

Could we not justly, by Adam's sin, have lost our very existence? And if we had not existed, could we have had communion with God? "But we have not lost it in fact. We still have 'fellowship with the Father and with the Son.'" Who have? All men born into the world? All Jews, and Turks, and Heathens? Have all that are called Christians? Have the generality of Protestants 'fellowship with the Father and the Son'? What fellowship? Just as much as light has with darkness, as much as Christ has with Belial. The bulk of mankind, Christians as well as Heathens, Protestants as well as Papists, are at this day, and have been ever since they were born, 'without God,' *ἄθεοι, Atheists in the world.*

We need not therefore say, "Their fellowship with God, is owing to his mercy through a Redeemer." They have none at all: no fellowship with *the only true God*, and *with Jesus Christ whom he hath sent*. Indeed they have no great need of Jesus Christ, according to your account: seeing "All that God's grace doth for us in Christ, to repair what we lost in Adam, is raising us up at the last day!" You add, "And therefore communion with God, is either the same

grace which was vouchsafed to Adam, continued to us," (p. 149;) (to every man born into the world, as naturally as seeing or hearing!) "Or, if there be any thing extraordinary in it" (which you judge can hardly be allowed!) "it belongs to the redundancy of grace, which has no relation to any thing we lost by Adam." That the whole passage has relation to what we lost in Adam, has been shown already. But what conception you have of communion with God is easily seen by this wonderful account of it.

"However, this text gives no intimation, that Adam's posterity lost communion with God for his sin." It shows that Adam did so. And all his posterity has done the same. Whence is this, unless from his sin?

Ver. 24. 'So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.'

Although God is equally present in every place, yet this was a clear token, that man had not now that near communion with him, which he had enjoyed before his sin.

18. Prop. "The fall brought upon mankind God's displeasure and curse, so we are by nature the children of wrath."

"The text on which this is grounded, Eph. ii. 2, 3, we have considered before." And those considerations have been answered at large. (p. 150.) You add, "How mankind could be justly brought under God's displeasure for Adam's sin, we cannot understand. On the contrary, we do understand, *it is unjust*. And therefore, unless our understanding or perception of truth, be false, *it must be unjust*. But understanding must be the same in all beings, as far as they do understand. Therefore, if we understand, that *it is unjust*, God understands it to be so too." (p. 151.)

Plausible enough. But let us take the argument in pieces. "How mankind could be *justly* brought under God's displeasure, for Adam's sin, we cannot understand." I allow it. I cannot understand, that is, clearly or fully comprehend the deep of the divine judgment therein: no more than I can, how *the whole* brute creation through his sin should have been *made subject to vanity*, and should *groan together*, in weakness, in various pain, in death, *until this day*. "On the contrary, we do understand, *it is unjust*." I do not understand, it is. It is quite beyond my understanding. It is a depth which I cannot fathom. "Therefore unless our understanding, or perception of truth, be false, *it must be unjust*." Here lies the deceit. You shift the terms, and place as equivalent those which are not equivalent. Our *perception of truth* cannot be false: our *understanding or apprehension of things may*. "But understanding must be the same in all beings." Yes, in the former sense of the word, but not in the latter. "Therefore if we understand (apprehend) *it is unjust*, God understands it so too." Nay verily: 'As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are *his thoughts* higher than *our thoughts*.'

"What a God must he be, who can curse his innocent creatures before they have a being! Is this thy God, O Christian?" Bold

enough! So Lord B—— “Moses’s God your God?” He is mine: although he said, *Cursed be Canaan*, including his posterity, before they had a being. And although he now permits millions to come into a world, which every where bears the marks of *his displeasure*. And he permits human souls to exist in bodies, which are (*how we know not, but the fact we know*) *conceived and born in sin*, by reason whereof, all men coming into the world are *children of wrath*. But he has provided a Saviour for them all. And this fully acquits both his justice and mercy.

19. “So as we are by nature bond-slaves to Satan,” (2 Tim. ii. 26.) And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the Devil, who are ‘taken captive at his will.’ (p. 152.)

But you say, “The apostle speaks this of the unconverted Gentiles, who were slaves to Satan, not through Adam, but through their own fault.” Both one and the other. But how does it appear, that he speaks this of the Gentiles only?

Without offering at any proof of this, you go on, “The clause ‘taken captive by him,’ is spoken, not of the Devil, but of the servant of the Lord.” For thus the place should be rendered, That they may wake out of the snare of the Devil, being *revived by him*, that is, the servant of the Lord, to his, that is, God’s will.” (p. 153.)

Well, the proof. The word *σωγεω* signifies to *revive*: and so here, to restore men to life and salvation.” As a proof of this sense of the word, you cite Luke v. 10. But this rather proves the contrary. For there it has nothing to do with *reviving*. We read in the verse before of the ‘fishes which they had taken:’ alluding to which ‘Jesus said unto Simon, from henceforth thou shalt catch men:’ *take them captive* in the gospel net. Although therefore it were allowed, (which cannot be done,) that *his* related, not to the word immediately preceding, but to another which stands three verses off, yet even this would avail nothing: since the sense which you impose upon *σωγεω*, is what it will by no means bear.

You say indeed, “It always means, to *take alive, or save alive.*” (p. 154.) It does mean to *take alive*. But you bring no one authority to prove, that it ever means, *to save alive*. It therefore “suits the Devil and his snare” admirably well: for he does not take therein those who are *free among the dead*: but those who are alive in a natural, though dead in a spiritual sense.

“But however this be, they were not led captive through Adam’s sin, but their own wickedness.” (p. 155.) They were *bond-slaves to Satan*, (which was the point to be proved,) through Adam’s sin, and their own wickedness.

“Yea, but what an inconsistency must that be in the divine dispensations and in the Scriptures, if it can be made appear from them, that God hath for no fault of our’s, but only for Adam’s one sin, put us all into the hands of the Devil: when he hath been in all ages providing means to preserve or rescue mankind from him?” (p. 156.) What can be made appear from the Scriptures is this: that from *Adam sin passed upon all men*: that hereby all men, being by nature

dead in sin, cannot of themselves resist the Devil: and that consequently, all who will not accept of help from God, are ‘taken captive by Satan at his will.’ And there is no inconsistency between this and any of the Divine dispensations.

“Prop. And justly liable to all punishments in this world, and that which is to come.”

That all men are liable to these for Adam’s sin *alone*, I do not assert: but they are so, for their own outward and inward sins, which through their own fault, spring from the infection of their nature. And this, I think, may fairly be inferred from Rom. vi. 23, ‘The wages of sin is death:’ its due reward: death, temporal, spiritual, and eternal. God grant, we may never feel it so!

19. You conclude this part: “I cannot see that we have advanced one step farther than where we were at the conclusion of the first part, namely, That the consequences of Adam’s first sin upon us, are labour, sorrow, and mortality, and no other.” (p. 102.)

The contrary to this having been so largely proved, instead of repeating those proofs over again, I shall close this part with that beautiful description of the present state of man, which Mr. Hervey gives us from Mr. Howe’s **LIVING TEMPLE**. “Only,” says he, “let me hint, that it considers the human soul as originally ‘a habitation of God through the Spirit.’

“That he hath withdrawn himself and left this his temple desolate, we have many sad and plain proofs before us. The *stately ruins* are visible to every eye, and bear in their front (yet extant,) this doleful inscription, *Here God once dwelt*. Enough appears of the admirable structure of the soul of man, to show the divine presence did sometime reside in it: more than enough of vicious deformity to proclaim he is now retired and gone. The *lamps* are extinct, the *altar* overturned; the light and love are now vanished, which did the one shine with so heavenly brightness, the other burn with so pious fervour. The *golden candlestick* is displaced, to make room for the throne of the prince of darkness. The sacred *incense*, which sent up its rich perfumes, is exchanged for a poisonous, hellish vapour. The comely *order* of this house is all turned into confusion: the beauties of holiness into noisome impurities: the house of prayer into a den of thieves. Thieves of the worst kind; for every lust is a thief, and every theft is sacrilege. The noble powers which were designed and dedicated to divine *contemplation* and *delight* in God, are alienated to the service of the most despicable idols, and employed in the vilest embraces: to behold and admire lying vanities, to indulge and cherish lust and wickedness.

“There is not now a *system*, an entire table of coherent truths to be found, or a frame of holiness, but some shivered parcels. And if any with great toil and labour apply themselves, to draw out here one piece, and there another, and set them together; they serve rather to show, how exquisite the divine workmanship was in the *original composition*, than the excellent purposes for which the whole was at first designed. Some pieces agree and own one another:

but how soon are our inquiries nonplused and superseded ! How many attempts have been made, since that fearful fall and ruin of this fabric, to compose again the truths of so many several kinds into their distinct orders, and make up frames of science or useful knowledge ! And after so many ages, nothing is finished in any kind. Sometimes truths are misplaced ; and what belongs to one kind, is transferred to another, where it will not fitly match : sometimes falsehood inserted, which shatters or disturbs the whole frame. And what with much fruitless pains is done by one hand, is dashed in pieces by another : and it is the work of a following age, to sweep away the fine-spun cobwebs of a former. And those truths which are of greatest use, though not most out of sight, are least regarded : their tendency and design are overlooked, or they are so loosened and torn off, that they cannot be wrought in, so as to take hold of the soul, but hover as faint, ineffectual notions, that signify nothing.

“ Its very *fundamental powers* are shaken and disjointed, and their order toward one another confounded and broken. So that what is judged *considerable* is not *considered*, what is recommended as *lovely* and *eligible* is not loved and chosen. Yea, ‘ the truth which is after godliness,’ is not so much believed as *hated*, or ‘ held in unrighteousness ;’ and shines with too feeble a light, in that malignant darkness, which ‘ comprehends it not.’ You come amidst all this confusion, into the ruined palace of some great prince, in which you see, here the fragments of a noble pillar, there the shattered pieces of some curious imagery, and all lying neglected and useless, among heaps of dirt. He that invites you to take a view of the soul of man, gives you but such another prospect, and doth but say to you, *Behold the desolation !* All things rude and waste. So that should there be any pretence to the divine presence, it might be said, *If God be here, why is it thus ?* The faded glory, the darkness, the disorder, the impurity, the decayed state in all respects of this temple, too plainly show, *The Great Inhabitant is gone !*”

NEWINGTON, Jan. 21.

In your Third Part, you propose, first, To answer some objections and queries : and then to consider the connexion of the doctrine of original sin with other parts of religion.

“ Obj. I. Are we not in worse moral circumstances than Adam was before he fell ? I answer, (p. 168,) 1. If by moral circumstances you mean the state of religion and virtue, it is certain the greatest part of mankind ever were, and still are very corrupt. But this is not the fault of their nature, but occasioned by the abuse of it, in prostituting reason to appetite, whereby, in process of time, they have sunk themselves into the most lamentable degrees of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery.”

But how came this ? How came all nations thus to “ abuse their nature,” thus to “ prostitute reason to appetite ?” How came they all to sink into this “ lamentable ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, debauchery ?” How came it, that half of them, at least, if

their nature was uncorrupt, did not use it well? Submit appetite to reason, and rise, while the other sunk? "Process of time" does not help us out of all. For if it made the one half of mankind more and more vicious, it ought by the same degrees to have made the other half more and more virtuous. If men were no more inclined to one side than the other, this must absolutely have been the event. Turn and wind as you please, you will never be able to get over this. You will never account for this fact, that the bulk of mankind have, in all ages, "prostituted their reason to appetite," even till they sunk into "lamentable ignorance, superstition, idolatry, injustice, and debauchery;" but by allowing their very nature to be in fault, to be more inclined to vice than virtue.

"But if we have all a corrupt nature, which as we cannot, so God will not wholly remove in this life, then why do we try to reform the world?" Why? Because, whether the corrupt nature be wholly removed or not, men may be reformed so as to 'cease from evil,' to be 'renewed in the spirit of their mind, and by patient continuance in well-doing, to seek,' and find, 'glory, and honour, and immortality.'

"I answer, 2. If by moral circumstances you mean provision and means for spiritual improvement, those given us through Christ are far greater than Adam had before he sinned." (p. 169.) To those who believe in Christ they are. But above four-fifths of the world are Mahometans or Pagans still. And have these (immensely the greater part of mankind: to say nothing of Popish nations) greater provision and means for spiritual improvement, than Adam before he sinned?

"But if, 3. by moral circumstances you mean moral" (rather natural) "abilities, or mental powers," (a consideration quite foreign to the question,) "I answer, The Scriptures no where compare our faculties with Adam's. Nor know I how we can judge, but by comparing the actions of Adam in innocence with what men have performed since." (p. 170.)

Yes, we can judge thus. There could be no defect in Adam's understanding, when he came first out of the hands of his Creator, but there are essential defects in mine and yours, and every man's whom we know.—Our *apprehension* is indistinct, our *judgment* false, our *reasoning* wrong, in a thousand instances. So it always was: and so it is still, after all the care we can possibly take. Therefore "our faculties are not as sound and fit for right action, as Adam's were before he sinned."

"But any man of common understanding might have dressed and kept the garden as well as he." I can neither affirm nor deny this. For we know not *how he dressed and kept it*.

"Nor doth it appear, that in giving names to all the creatures, he showed any extraordinary penetration into their natures. For that the names he gave truly expressed the several qualities of them, is a mere fiction, without any foundation in Scripture-history, or the names of animals in the original Hebrew." (p. 171.)

This is really strange ! That any man of learning should be so hardy as to affirm this, after the numberless instances which have been produced of Hebrew names, expressing the most essential property of each animal.

And is this supposition likewise “without any foundation in Scripture-history ?” What is that ? Gen. ii. 19, ‘And the Lord God brought every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, unto Adam, to see what he would call them,’ to make proof of his understanding. ‘And whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.’ Now whether those names were Hebrew or not, (which you *affect* to doubt,) can it be supposed that God would have permitted them to stand, if they had not suited the nature of each creature ? It is bold therefore to affirm, That “many of his posterity could have given names to them as well as he : and that therefore this is not a proof, that he had any capacity superior to us.” (p. 172.)

You proceed, “Surely his eating the forbidden fruit is no evidence of superior abilities.” (p. 173.) And it is no evidence of the contrary ; “seeing” (as you yourself observe,) “what his *special* temptation was, we do not know.” Therefore, neither do we know whether any of his posterity could have overcome it : much less, that “many of his posterity have overcome temptations more violent than his.” All this is talking in the dark, ‘not knowing what we say, neither whereof we affirm.’

“And now let any man see, whether there be any ground in Revelation, for exalting Adam’s nature as divines have done, who have affirmed, that all his faculties were eminently perfect, and entirely set to the love and obedience of his Creator.” (p. 175.) “And yet these same suppose him to have been guilty of the vilest act that ever was committed.” (p. 176.)

They suppose Adam to have been created holy and wise, like his Creator : and yet capable of falling from it. They suppose farther, that through temptations, of which we cannot possibly judge, he did fall from that state ; and that hereby he brought pain, labour, and sorrow on himself and all his posterity : together with death, not only temporal, but spiritual, and (without the grace of God) eternal. And it must be confessed, that not only a few divines, but the whole body of Christians, in all ages, did suppose this, till after seventeen hundred years a sweet-tongued orator arose, not only more enlightened than silly Adam, but than any of his wise posterity : and declared, that the whole supposition was folly, nonsense, inconsistency, and blasphemy !

“Obj. II. But do not the Scriptures say, Adam was created after God’s own image ? And do his posterity bear that image now ?”

“The Scriptures do say, Gen. i. 27, ‘God created man in his own image.’ But whatever that phrase means here, it doubtless means the same in Gen. ix. 6, ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed : for in the image of God made he man.’” Cer-

tainly it has the same meaning in both places: for the latter plainly refers to the former. And thus much we may fairly infer from hence, that the image of God, wherein man was at first created, whereinsoever it consisted, was not utterly effaced in the time of Noah. Yea, so much of it will always remain in all men, as will justify the punishing murderers with death. But we can in nowise infer from hence, that that entire image of God, in which Adam was at first created, now remains in all his posterity.

The words of Gen. v. 3, rendered literally, are, ‘He begat in his likeness, according to his image.’ ‘Adam,’ says Mr. Hervey, ‘was created in the image of God.’ After his fall, the sacred historian varies his style, and with a remarkable peculiarity, as well as propriety, says, *Adam begat a son in his own likeness*; (so it must be translated according to all the rules of grammar, Adam being the nearest antecedent.) That every reader may advert to this melancholy, but important truth, it is enforced by a very emphatical repetition: *after his own image*, as contradistinguished from that *image of God*, mentioned in the preceding verse: which expressions are evidently intended to denote the difference between the state in which Adam was created and Seth begotten.”

“The two following texts are brought by *the Assembly* to show, what the image of God was, in which Adam was made.” (p. 178.) Col. iii. 10, ‘And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him.’ Eph. iv. 24, ‘Put on the new man, which after the image of God is created in righteousness and true holiness.’

“I answer, These texts are parallel. ‘The old man’ means ‘a wicked life, the new man,’ a good life; to which they were formed and created by the gospel dispensation. And this ‘new man,’ this new life is ‘after the image,’ that is, agreeable to the nature of God.” (p. 179.)

As you advance no proof of this perfectly new interpretation, I leave it to shift for itself.

To disprove the common interpretation, you add, “Adam could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness; because habits of holiness cannot be created without our knowledge, concurrence, or consent. For holiness in its nature, implies the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it cannot be holiness.” (p. 180.)

What is holiness? Is it not essentially love? The love of God and of all mankind? Love producing ‘bowels of mercies, humbleness of mind, meekness, gentleness, long-suffering?’ And cannot God shed abroad this love in any soul, without his concurrence? Antecedent to his knowledge or consent? And supposing this to be done, will love change its nature? Will it be no longer holiness? This argument can never be sustained; unless you would play upon the word *habits*. Love is holiness wherever it exists. And God could create either men or angels, endued from the very first moment of their existence, with whatsoever degree of love he pleased.

You “think, on the contrary, it is demonstration, that we cannot be righteous or holy, we cannot *observe* what is right, without our own free and explicit choice.” I suppose you mean, *practise* what is right. But a man may be righteous, before he *does* what is right, holy in heart before he is holy in life. The confounding these two all along, seems the ground of your strange imagination, that Adam “must choose to be righteous, must exercise thought and reflection before he could be righteous.” Why so? “Because righteousness is the right use and application of our powers.” Here is your capital mistake. No, it is not: it is the right *state* of our powers. It is the right *disposition* of our *soul*, the right *temper* of our *mind*. Take this with you, and you will no more dream, that “God could not create man in righteousness and true holiness:” or that “to talk of wanting that righteousness in which Adam was created, is to talk of nothing we want.” (p. 181.)

On Rom. ii. 14, you observe, “This text clearly proves, that natural reason and understanding, is a rule of action to all mankind, and that all men ought to follow it. This therefore overthrows the whole doctrine of original sin.” (p. 183.) How do you prove the consequence? May not men have *some* reason left, which in *some measure* discerns good from evil, and yet be deeply fallen, even as to their understanding, as well as their will and affections?

On Eccles. vii. 29, ‘God hath made man upright, but they have found out many inventions,’ (p. 184, 185,) you say, “*Man* here means all mankind; *upright*, endued with powers to know and perform their duty.” You offer no proof for either of these assertions. And without it I cannot receive them.

Again, “*They* (you say) means mankind in general.” I rather believe it means our first parents, who are by Moses likewise comprehended under the common name of *man*, or rather **אָדָם**, *Adam*. So Gen. v. 2, ‘God called their name *Adam* in the day when they were created.’ And in the day that they fell, whoever reads Gen. iii. will see *they found out* not one, but *many inventions*. This text therefore in its obvious meaning teaches both the original uprightness, and subsequent fall of man.

From all these texts it manifestly appears, 1. That man was created in the image of God, 2. That this image consisted not only in his rational and immortal nature, and his dominion over the creatures, but also in *knowledge*, actual knowledge both of God and of his works, in the right *state* of his intellectual powers, and in *love*, which is *true holiness*.

“Obj. III. But do we not derive from Adam a moral *taint* and *infestation*, whereby we have a *natural propensity* to sin?” (p. 186.)

“I answer, we have many natural appetites and passions, which if they grow irregular, become sinful. But this does not amount to a natural propensity to sin.” But is not pride sin? Is not idolatry sin? And is it not idolatry, to ‘love the creature more than the Creator?’ Is not revenge sin? Is it not sin to ‘look upon a woman,’ so as to lust after her? And have not all men a natural propensity to these

things? They have all then a *natural propensity* to sin. Nevertheless this propensity is not *necessary*, if by necessary you mean *irresistible*. We can resist and conquer it too, by the grace which is ever at hand.

This *propensity* to pride, to revenge, to idolatry, (call it *taint*, or any thing,) cannot be pleasing to God, who yet in fact does permit that it should descend from Adam to his latest posterity. And “we can neither help nor hinder” its descending to us. Indeed we can heap up plausible arguments, to prove the impossibility of it. But I *feel* it, and the argument drops. Bring ever so many proofs, that there can be no such thing as motion. I *move* and they vanish away.

“But nature cannot be morally corrupted, but by the choice of a moral agent.” (p. 187.) You may play upon words as long as you please; but still I hold this fast: I (and you too, whether you will own it or not) am inclined, and was ever since I can remember, antecedently to any choice of my own, to pride, revenge, idolatry. If you will not call these *moral corruptions*, call them just what you will. But the fact I am as well assured of, as that I have any memory or understanding.

“But some have attempted to explain this intricate affair.” (p. 188.) I do not commend their wisdom. I do not attempt to explain even how I, at this moment, stretch out my hand, or move my finger.

One more of your assertions I must not pass over. “It is absurd to say, infection is derived from Adam, independent of the will of God. And to say, it is by his will, is to make him the author of the pollution.” (p. 189.) We answer, It is not derived from Adam, independent of the will of God; that is, his permissive will: but our allowing this, does not make him the author of the pollution.

“Obj. IV But do not the vices of parents often infect their children?” (p. 190, 191.) I think we cannot deny it.

“Obj. V How can we account for children’s beginning so soon to sin, but by supposing they have a natural propensity to it?” (p. 192.)

“I answer, Who can tell, how soon they begin?” Then they begin when they first show wrong tempers: such as plain, undeniable frowardness, revenge, self-will, which is as soon as they have any exercise of reason. So that the use of reason and the abuse, generally commence and grow up together. As soon as their faculties appear at all, they appear to be disordered: the wrong *state* of their powers, being easily inferred from their continual wrong *application* of them.

“But if parents were wise and virtuous themselves, and then endeavoured to bring up their children virtuously, there would be less wickedness in the world.” There would: but this does not reach the point; nor, that “undisciplined children contract bad habits.” I have known wise and virtuous parents, who did earnestly labour to bring up their children virtuously; and disciplined them with all possible care, from the very first dawn of reason. Yet these very

children showed *bad tempers* before it was possible they could “contract *bad habits*.” They daily evidenced the *wrong state* of all their faculties, both of their understanding, will, and affections, just contrary both to the examples and instructions of all that were round about them. Here then those *wrong tempers* were not owing to “the fault of careless or ungodly parents :” nor could be rationally accounted for, but by the supposing those children to have a *natural propensity* to evil.

It is indeed a general rule, ‘Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it,’ (Prov. xxii. 6 :) and there is much truth in that observation, ‘Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child ; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him,’ (ver. 15 :) that is, prudent correction is the most probable means which you can use to remove that foolishness. Yet this no way contradicts what is matter of daily experience, that we have a *natural propensity* to evil. Nay, the latter of these texts strongly confirms it: for if there be no such propensity, how comes *foolishness* (that is *wickedness*, in the language of Solomon) to be ‘bound in the heart of a child ?’ Of every child, of children in general, as the phrase manifestly imports. It is not from education here: it is supposed to be antecedent to education, whether good or bad. “Oh, foolishness means only *strong appetite*.” Yes, *strong appetite to evil*. Otherwise it would not call for the *rod of correction*, or need to be *driven far from him*.

“Obj. VI. Might not Adam’s posterity be said to sin in him, as Levi is said to pay tithes in Abraham ?” (Heb. vii. 9.)

If the querist means, not to *prove* a doctrine already proved, but only to *illustrate* one expression by another, your answer, “That it is a bold figure,” (p. 195,) does not at all affect him. It is so: but still it may be pertinently cited to illustrate a similar expression.

“Obj. VII. ‘But there is a law in our members which wars against the law of our minds, and brings us into captivity to the law of sin and death.’ (p. 199.) And does not this prove, that we come into the world with *sinful propensities* ?

You answer, 1. “If we come into the world with them, they are *natural*; but if *natural*, *necessary*; and if *necessary*, then *no sin*.” (p. 200.)

If the consequence were good, with regard to what is so *natural* and *necessary*, as to be *irresistible*, yet certainly it is not good, with regard to those propensities, which we may both resist and conquer.

You answer, 2. “The apostle does not in this chapter, speak of any man as he comes into the world, but as he is afterward depraved and corrupted by his own wicked choice.” Where is the proof ? How does it appear, that he does not speak of men corrupted both by choice and by nature ?

You answer, 3. “He does not speak of himself, or any regenerate man, but of a Jew under the power of sin.” (p. 200.) Nay, your

argument proves he does not speak of any Jew. For in order to prove, “the apostle does not speak of himself,” you say, “the persons of whom he speaks, were, *before the commandment came*, i. e. before they came under the law, *once without the law*. But the apostle never was without the law.” No, nor any Jew. “For he was born, and continued *under the law*, till he was a Christian.” So did all the Jews, as well as he;—“and therefore it cannot be true, that he” or any Jew whatever, “was *without the law* before he came under it.” So you have clearly proved, that the apostle does not in this passage speak of any Jew at all.

But why do you think he does speak of Jews? Nay, of them only? It “appears, you say, from ver. 1, ‘I speak to them that know the law.’ For the Gentiles never were *under the law*.” Yes, they were: all the Gentiles who were *convinced of sin*, were *under the law* in the sense here spoken of, under the *condemning power* of the law ‘written in their hearts,’ for transgressing which they were under the wrath of God. And this whole chapter, from the seventh to the twenty-fourth verse, describes the state of all those, Jews or Gentiles, who *saw* and *felt* the wickedness both of their hearts and lives, and groaned to be delivered from it.

Many passages in your paraphrase on the former part of this chapter, are liable to much exception; but as they do not immediately touch the point in question, I pass on to the latter part.

Ver. 14. ‘I am carnal, sold under sin.’ “He means a willing slavery.” (p. 216.) Quite the contrary, as appears from the very next words, ‘For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, I do not; but what I hate that I do.’ *What I hate*: not barely, “what my reason disapproves;” but what I really detest and abhor, but cannot help.

Ver. 17. ‘Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.’ “It is my sinful propensities, my indulged appetites and passions.” (p. 217.) True; but those propensities were antecedent to that indulgence.

“But the apostle cannot mean, that there is something in man which makes him sin, whether he will or not. For then it would not be sin at all.” Experience explains his meaning. I have felt in me a thousand times, something which made me transgress God’s law, whether I would or not. Yet I dare not say that *transgression of the law* was “no sin at all.”

Ver. 18. ‘For I know, that in me, that is, in my flesh,’ (not my “fleshy appetites” only, but my whole nature while unrenewed,) “dwelleth no good thing. For to will indeed, ‘is present with me;’ not barely “that natural faculty, the will,” but an actual will to do good, as evidently appears from the following words, ‘But how to perform that which is good, I find not:’ I have the desire, but not the power.

Ver. 19. ‘For the good that I would,’ that I desire and choose, ‘I do not: but the evil which I would not,’ which I hate, ‘that I do.’

Ver. 20. ‘Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I, but sin that dwelleth in me :’ but “the prevalency of sensual affections,” (p. 218,) yea sinful tempers of every kind, “settled and ruling in my heart,” both by nature and habit.

Ver. 21. ‘I find then, that when I would do good,’ when I choose and earnestly desire it, I cannot : ‘evil is present with me ;’ as it were gets in between.

Ver. 22. ‘For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man :’ my mind, my conscience approves it.

Ver. 23. ‘But I see another law in my members which warreth against the law in my mind :’ (p. 219.) “Another principle of action which fights against my reason” and conscience, ‘and bringeth me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members :’ which “captivates and enslaves me to the principle of wickedness.” (Strange language for *you* to use !) “Seated in the lusts of the flesh :” seated indeed in all my tempers, passions, and appetites, which are the several members of *the old man*.

Ver. 24. ‘O wretched man that I am : who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?’ “He is under the power of such passions, as his own reason disapproves, but is too weak to conquer : and N. B. being a Jew, he stands condemned to eternal death by the law. How shall such a wretched Jew be delivered from sinful lusts, and the curse of the law ?” Did then none but a Jew ever cry out, under the burden of sin, ‘wretched man that I am ?’ Are none but Jews “under the power of such passions, as their own reason disapproves, but is too weak to conquer ?” And does the law of God “condemn to eternal death,” no sinners beside Jews ? Do not Christians also, (in the wide sense of the word,) groan to be ‘delivered from the body of this death ?’ With what truth, with what sense can you restrain this passage to a Jew, any more than to a Turk ?

I cannot but observe upon the whole, the question is, “Does not Rom. vii. 23, show, that we come into the world with sinful propensities ?” (This is all that is pertinent in the objection awkwardly proposed, p. 199.) But instead of keeping to this, you spend above twenty pages in proving, that this chapter does not describe a regenerate person ! It may, or it may not : but this does not touch the question, “Do not men come into the world with sinful propensities ?”

We have undoubtedly an additional proof, that they do, in the words of Jeremiah, ch. xvii. 9, ‘The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked : Who can know it ?’ On this you descant, (one instance of a thousand, of your artful manner of declaiming, in order to forestall the reader’s judgment, and ‘deceive the hearts of the simple,’) “Christians too generally neglecting the study of the Scripture, content themselves with a few scraps, which though wrong understood, they make the test of truth, in contradiction to the whole tenor of revelation. Thus this text has been misapplied to prove, that every man’s heart is so desperately wicked, that no

man can know how wicked his heart is." (p. 221.) O what πισταλογια. *persuasiveness of speech!* After reading this, I was much inclined to believe, without going a step farther, that this text had been "generally misunderstood." I thought, probably it has been misapplied, and does not assert, that every man's 'heart is desperately wicked.' But no sooner did I read over the very verses you cite, than the clear light appeared again. (ver. 5.) 'Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and whose heart departeth from the Lord.' (p. 224.) That *man*, whom we are not to trust in, means man in general, cannot be denied. After repeating the intermediate verses, you yourself add, "He subjoins a reason. (ver. 9,) which demonstrates the error of trusting in man: 'The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it?' This text, therefore, does not mean, who can know his own heart, but another's." Whether it means one or both, it positively asserts, that 'the heart of man,' of men in general, of every man, is 'desperately wicked.' Therefore as to the main point contained therein, "Christians do not understand it wrong," (p. 224,) neither misapply it at all.

When I say, "I feel, I have a wicked heart," (p. 225.) another thing which you do not understand, I mean this, "I feel much pride remaining in my heart, much self-will, much unbelief. Now I really believe, pride and self-will, and unbelief, to be essentially wicked tempers. Therefore in whatever heart they remain, (and they remain in yours as well as mine,) that is a *wicked heart*.

After a long pause, you return to the 7th of the Romans and affirm, "We cannot from any thing in that chapter infer, that we came into the world with sinful dispositions derived from Adam; for the apostle says nothing about Adam." (p. 229.) He had said enough in the 5th chapter of the cause. Here he only describes the effect: the state of those, who are now 'brought to the birth:' but 'there is not yet strength to bring forth.'

"Nor can we infer from hence, that any man sins through a principle which it was never in his power to command. For then it would be no sin." Upon this I would only ask, Are you assured, that no man transgresses God's law, (whether you will call it sin, or not,) through a principle which it was never in his power to command? At least not for any time together? Every passionate man can confute you in this. He has sad experience of the contrary.

To those objections which you have, in some sort, answered, you subjoin the following questions.

Quest. I. "Is not the doctrine of original sin, necessary to account for the being of so much wickedness in the world?" (p. 231.)

You answer, "Adam's nature, it is allowed, was not sinful, and yet he sinned. Therefore this doctrine is no more necessary to account for the wickedness of the world than to account for Adam's sin." Yes, it is. I can account for one man's sinning, or a hundred, or even half mankind, suppose they were evenly poised between vice and virtue, from their own choice, which might turn one way

or the other. But I cannot possibly on this supposition account for the general wickedness of mankind in all ages and nations.

Again. "If men were never drawn into sin any other way, than as Adam was, namely by temptations offered from without, there might be something in this answer. But there are numberless instances of men sinning, though no temptation is offered from without. It is necessary, therefore, some other account should be given of their sinning than of Adam's. And how to account for the universal spread of sin over the whole world without one exception, if there were no corruption in their common head, would be an insurmountable difficulty." (Vind. p. 110.)

Quest. II. "How then are we born into the world?" (p. 232.)

You answer, "As void of actual knowledge as the brutes."

And can you really imagine that text, Job xi. 12, 'Vain man would be wise,' (evidently spoken of man in general,) 'though a man be born like a wild ass's colt ;' implies no more than, "Men are born void of actual knowledge?" Do we need inspiration to make this discovery, that a new-born child has no actual knowledge? Is man compared to *a wild ass*, of all animals the most stupid, to teach us no more than this? Yea, *a wild ass's colt*? Does not this intimate any thing of untractableness, sullenness, stubbornness, perverseness? "How keenly is the comparison pointed? Like the *ass*, an animal stupid even to a proverb: like the *ass's colt*, which must be still more egregiously stupid than its dam: like the *wild ass's colt*, which is not only blockish, but stubborn and refractory; neither has valuable qualities by nature, nor will easily receive them by discipline. The image in the original is yet more strongly touched. The particle *like* is not in the Hebrew, *Born a wild ass's colt*; or, as we should say in English, *a mere wild ass's colt*."^{*}

Yes, "We are born with many sensual appetites and passions: but every one of these are *in themselves good*." I grant all the appetites and passions originally implanted in our nature, *were* good in themselves. But are all that now exist in us good? "If not, they become evil only by excess or abuse." First, this may be doubted. I do not know, that love of praise, of power, of money, *become evil only by abuse*. I am afraid these and other passions, which we have had from our infancy, are evil *in themselves*. But be that as it may, in how few do we find even the more innocent passions and appetites, clear of excess or abuse? "But all that is wrong in them is from habit." This cannot be allowed as universally true. The little children of wise and pious parents, have not yet contracted ill habits. Yet before they can go alone, they show such passions as are palpably excessive, if not evil in themselves.

But whatever they are in themselves, here is the "grand difficulty, of which you give us no manner of solution;" "whence comes it to pass, that those appetites and passions which no doubt were at first kindly implanted in our nature, by an holy God, are now be-

* Theron and Aspasio, Dialogue 11.

come so excessive or irregular, that no one man from the beginning of the world has so resisted them, as to keep himself pure and innocent?"

"But without these appetites and passions, our nature would be defective, sluggish, or unarmed. Nor is there any one of them which we can at present spare." We could very well spare the excess and irregularity of them all: and possibly, some of the passions themselves, as love of praise, and love of revenge. The love of God would more than supply the place of both: neither does it suffer us to be *sluggish* or *inactive*. Nor does calm, Christian fortitude leave us *unarmed* against any danger which can occur. "But our reason would have nothing to struggle with." (p. 223.) O yes, not only all our reason, but all the grace we have received, has enough to struggle with, even when we do *not wrestle with flesh and blood*. We are still abundantly "exercised" by 'principalities and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places.'

"On the other hand, we are born with rational powers, which grow gradually capable of the most useful knowledge. And we under the gospel, have clear ideas of the Divine Perfections: we see our duty, and the most cogent reasons to perform it." This sounds well. But will *knowledge* balance *passion*? Or are *rational powers* a counterpoise to sensual appetites? Will *clear ideas* deliver men from lust or vanity? Or *seeing* the duty to love our enemies enable us to practise it? What are *cogent reasons* opposed to covetousness or ambition? A thread of tow that has touched the fire. "But the Spirit of God is promised for our assistance." Nay, but what need of him, upon your scheme? Man is sufficient for himself. *He that glorieth* on this hypothesis, must glory in himself, *not in the Lord*.

Quest. III. "How far is our present state the same with that of Adam in Paradise?" (p. 235.)

I suppose "our mental capacities are the same as Adam's, only that some are above, some below his standard. Probably there are many in the world much below Adam, in rational endowments. But possibly the force and acuteness of understanding was much greater in our Sir Isaac Newton than in Adam."

I do not apprehend this requires any answer. He that can believe it, let him believe it.

"We are next to inquire, upon what true grounds those parts of religion stand, which the *Schoolmen* have founded upon the doctrine of *original sin*: particularly the two grand articles of **REDEMPTION** and **REGENERATION**."

In what century did the *Schoolmen* write? How long before St. Augustine, (to go no higher?) A sad specimen this of "the honesty and impartiality with which you deliver your sentiments!"

I. REDEMPTION.

"Our fall, corruption, and apostacy in Adam has been made the reason why the Son of God came into the world and 'gave himself a ransom' for us."

And, undoubtedly, it is the reason. Accordingly the very first promise of the Redeemer was given presently after the fall. And given with a manifest reference to those evils which came on all men through Adam's transgression. Nor does it appear from any Scripture, that he would have come into the world at all, had not 'all men died in Adam.'

You yourself allow, "the Apostle affirms, Rom. v. 18, 19, that by 'the righteousness and obedience of Christ,' all men are delivered from the condemnation and sentence they came under through Adam's disobedience: and that thus far the redemption by Christ stands in connexion with Adam's transgression."-(p. 238.)

"But the redemption by Christ, extends far beyond the consequences of Adam's transgression." It does. Men receive far greater blessings by Christ, than those they lost by Adam. But this does not prove, that our fall in Adam is not the ground of our redemption by Christ.

Let us once more consider the text itself. (ver. 15) 'But not as the offence, so is the free-gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace,' the blessing which flows from the mere mercy of God, 'which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.' (Ver. 16.) 'For not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one offence to condemnation; but the free-gift is of many offences unto justification.' In this respect, first, the free-gift by Christ, 'hath abounded much more' than the loss by Adam. And in this, secondly, ver. 17, 'If by one man's offence, DEATH spiritual and temporal, leading to death eternal REIGNED by one' over his whole posterity, much more they who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, the free-gift of justification and sanctification, 'shall REIGN in life' everlasting 'by one, Jesus Christ.' Let any one who calmly and impartially reads this passage judge, if this be not the plain, natural meaning of it.

But let us now observe your comment upon it. "Here the Apostle asserts a grace of God; which already hath abounded, beyond the effects of Adam's sin upon us." (p. 239.) It has, upon them that are justified and sanctified; but not upon all mankind.—"And which has respect, not to his one offence?"—Not to that only,—"but also to the many offences which men have personally committed.—Not to the DEATH which REIGNED by him."—Yes, verily: but over and above the removal of this, it hath also respect "to the LIFE in which *they who receive the abounding grace shall REIGN with him for ever.*"

Thus far you have proved just nothing. But you go on, "the death consequent on Adam's sin, is reversed by the redemption in Christ. But this is not the whole end of it by far. The grand reason and end of redemption is, 'the grace of God, and the gift by grace.' Infallibly it is; but this is not a different thing, but precisely the same with the free-gift. Consequently your whole structure raised on the supposition of that difference, is a mere castle in the air. But if *the gift by grace, and the free-gift are the very same thing, and if the gift by grace is "the grand reason and end of redemption," then our fall*

In Adam, to which you allow *the free-gift* directly refers, is “the reason of Christ’s coming into the world.”

“But the Scriptures of the New Testament (excepting Rom. v. 12—19. and 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.) always assign the actual wickedness of mankind as the reason of Christ’s coming into the world.” (p. 240.) They generally do assign this, their outward and inward wickedness. But this does not exclude the wickedness of their nature, springing from their fall in Adam. Rather this, which is expressed in those two places at least, is presupposed in all places. Particularly in the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, where he describes the enormous wickedness both of the Jews and Gentiles. “It is true,* he begins his discourse with an account of the actual transgressions of the idolatrous Gentiles. Afterwards, chap. iii. he treats of the depravity and corruption of all mankind: and then proceeds, chap. v. to show, that we are all made sinners by Adam, and that ‘by his offence judgment is come upon all men to condemnation.’” The Apostle’s method is clear and natural. He begins with that which is most obvious, even actual sin; and then proceeds to speak of original sin, as the joint cause of the necessity of redemption for all men. But which way can we infer, that because he begins with the mention of actual sins, in order to demonstrate the necessity of redemption, therefore he excludes original out of the account? Neither can we infer, that because it is not expressly mentioned in other texts, (p. 241.) therefore it is not implied.

“But the Redeemer himself saith not one word of redeeming us from the corruption of nature derived from Adam. (p. 242.) And seeing he spake exactly according to the commission which the Father gave him, we may safely conclude, it was no part of his commission to preach the doctrine of original sin.” Just as safely may we conclude, that it was no part of his commission, to teach and make known to men, the *many things* which he *had to say* to his Apostles before his death, which they *could not* then *bear*, (John xvi. 12.) but which according to his promise, he afterwards taught them by his Spirit, and by them to the world. It makes no difference as to the ground of our faith, whether a doctrine was delivered by Christ himself or by his Apostles: and whether it be written in any of the four gospels, or of the divine epistles. There is only this difference. The epistles were written after the resurrection and ascension of Christ. Therefore after the full commencement of the gospel dispensation: whereas the discourses of Christ recorded in the gospels, were delivered before the gospel dispensation was properly begun. Therefore we are to look for the peculiar doctrines of Christ, rather in the Epistles than in the Gospels. However Christ did speak of this, and referred to it more than once during his personal ministry: particularly in his discourse with Nicodemus, and Matt. xxiii. But it is not surprising, that he did not speak so largely, of redeeming us from sin, original or actual, by the price of his blood, before that price was actually paid, as the Apostles did afterward. He considered the

* Vindication, p. 116, &c.

littleness of their knowledge, with the violence of their prejudices. Therefore we have no cause to be surprised, that no more is said on this head in those discourses which Christ delivered before his death. *But to us he has told it plainly, and we do find the doctrines of original sin and redemption from it by Jesus Christ, distinguished emphatically in almost every page of the inspired Epistles.*

To sum up this: 1. Christ speaks very sparingly of many things, whereof his Apostles have spoken largely: 2. Yet he does speak of the corruption of our nature, (which St. Paul expressly tells us is derived from Adam,) particularly in the 23d of St. Matthew and the 3d of St. John. 3. Wherever he speaks of *saving that which was lost*, he in effect speaks of this: especially Matt. xviii. 11, where he mentions *little children* as lost: which could not be by actual sin: 4. There was the less need of our Lord's speaking much on this head, because it was so fully declared in the Old Testament, and was not questioned by any of those false teachers, against whom he was chiefly concerned to warn his disciples.

You add, "It has been delivered as a fundamental truth, that no man will come to Christ, the Second Adam, who is not first thoroughly convinced of the several things he lost in the first Adam." (p. 243.) This is a fundamental truth; none will come to Christ as a Redeemer, till he is thoroughly convinced, he wants a Redeemer. No man ever will come to him as a Saviour, till he knows and feels himself a *lost* sinner. None will come to the physician, but *they that are sick*; and are thoroughly sensible of it: that are deeply convinced of their sinful tempers, as well as sinful words and actions. And these tempers they well know were antecedent to their choice, and came into the world with them. So far "every man who comes to Christ, is first convinced of the several things he lost by Adam," though he may not clearly know the source of that corruption which he sees and feels in his own heart and life. "But why does our Lord never mention Adam, or the corruption of our nature through him?" He does mention this corruption, and he presupposes it in all his public discourses. He does not mention it largely and explicitly, for the reasons above recited. "But the Apostles are wholly silent on this head, in their sermons recorded in the *Acts*: and in their Epistles too." (p. 243, 244.) Are they *wholly silent* in their Epistles? This is a violent mistake. And as to their sermons, it may be observed. 1. That we have not one whole sermon of any one Apostle, recorded in the *Acts*: nor, it may be, the twentieth part of one. 2. That it was not needful for them to prove, what none of their hearers denied: —No, not even the Heathens: even these allowed the corruption of human nature. Even these received it as an undeniable fact,

"Vitiis nemo sine nascitur."

No man is born without vices.

These acknowledged (as Seneca expresses) *Omnia in omnibus vicia sunt*: All vices are in all men. These saw, there were hardly any good men to be found upon the face of the earth: and openly testified it.

*Rari quippe boni, numero vix sunt totidem quot
Thebarum porta, vel divitis ostia Nili :
The good lie scatter'd in this barren soil,
Few as the gates of Thebes, or mouths of Nile.*

They had also among them some faint account of the cause of that overflowing corruption. So Horace, immediately after he had asserted the fact,

*Audax omnia perpeti
Gens huic nra ruit per vetitum nefas :
Lawless, and unrestrain'd, the human race,
Rushes through all the paths of daring wickedness :*

Glances at the cause of it, in their fabulous manner.

*Audax Japeti genus
Ignem fraude mala gentibus intulit :
Post ignem aetheream domo
Subductum, macies, et nova febrium
Terris incubuit cohors :
Semotique prius tarda necessitas
Letki corripuit gradum.*

Prometheus first provok'd the heavenly sire,
Purloining Jupiter's authentic fire :
Evil, from hence deriv'd, and brooding pain,
And strange disease with all the ghastly train,
Pour'd in upon the wretched sons of men :
While hasty Fate quicken'd the ting'ring pace
Of distant death, unveil'd the monster's face,
And gave into his hands our whole devoted race.

I observe, 3. It was neither needful nor proper, for an Apostle in his first sermon to a congregation wholly unawakened, to descant upon *original sin*. No man of common sense would do it now. Were I to preach to a certain congregation at Norwich, I should not say one word of Adam, but endeavour to show them, that their lives, and, therefore, their hearts, were corrupt and abominable *before God*.

You conclude this head, “ Guilt imputed, is imaginary guilt, and so no object of redemption.” I dare not say so as to my own particular. I pray God, of his tender mercy, to free me from this and all other guilt, ‘through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ! ’

II. REGENERATION.

“ Why must we be born again ? ” (p. 245.) (You subjoin the common, but, as you suppose, absurd answer;) “ because we are *born in sin* : nature is averse to all good and inclined to all evil. Therefore we must be born again, before we can please God.”

In order to confute this, you assert, “ Then it cannot be our duty to be born again ; nor consequently our fault, if we are not : because it is not in our power.” It is, by grace, though not by nature. By this we may all be born again. Therefore it is *our duty* : and if we fall short herein, it is *our own fault*.

“ But being born again does really signify, the gaining those habits of virtue, which make us children of God.” (p. 246.) Then St. Paul ought to have said, Not ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus : but ‘ ye are all the children of God, by gaining habits of virtue ! ’

Nay, but according to the whole tenor of Scripture, the being born again does really signify the being inwardly changed by the Almighty operation of the Spirit of God ; changed from sin to holiness : renewed in the image of him that created us. And why must we be so changed ? Because ‘ without holiness no man shall see the Lord :’ and because without this change, all our endeavours after holiness are ineffectual. God hath indeed “ endowed us with *understanding*, and given us abundant means.” But our understanding is as insufficient for that end, as are the outward means, if not attended with inward power.

You proceed to explain yourself at large. “ Christ informs us, That ‘ except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God ;’ and thereby teaches us, I. ‘ That God hath erected a kingdom, united in and under him, for his glory, and men’s mutual happiness.’ (p. 247.) II. ‘ He will finally admit none into it, who are not disposed to relish and promote the happiness of it.’ (p. 248.) (Both these propositions I willingly allow.) III. ‘ All wickedness is quite contrary to the nature and end of this kingdom. Therefore no wicked men can be fit members of it, unless there be a full persuasion, that reverence, love, and obedience, are due to God :’ (I add, and unless it be actually paid him : otherwise that persuasion but increases our condemnation :) “ Unless his favour is preferred before all other enjoyments whatsoever : unless there be a delight in the worship of God, and in converse with him : unless every appetite be brought into subjection to reason,” (add, and reason to the word of God :) “ How can any man be fit to dwell with God, or to do him service in his kingdom ?”

IV “ It is one thing to be born into God’s creation, another to be born into his peculiar kingdom. In order to an admittance into his peculiar kingdom, it is not enough for an intelligent being to exist.” (p. 250, 251.) I do not know that. Perhaps it is not possible, for God to create an intelligent being, without creating it duly subject to himself, that is, a subject of his peculiar kingdom. It is highly probable, the holy angels were subjects of his peculiar kingdom, from the first moment of their existence. Therefore the following peremptory assertion, and all of the like kind, are wholly groundless. “ It is absolutely necessary, before any creature can be a subject of this, that it learn to employ and exercise its powers, suitably to the nature of them.” It is not necessary at all. In this sense surely, God ‘ may do what he will with his own.’ He may bestow his own blessings as he pleases. ‘ Is thine eye evil, because he is good ?’

The premises then being gone, what becomes of the conclusion ? “ So that the being born into God’s peculiar kingdom, depends upon a right use and application of our life and being : and is the privilege only of those wise men whose spirits attain to a habit of true holiness.”

This stands without any proof at all. At best, therefore, it is extremely doubtful. But it must appear extremely absurd to those, who believe God can *create* spirits, both wise and holy : that he can stamp any creature with what measure of holiness he sees good, at the first moment of its existence.

The occasion of your running into this absurdity seems to be, that you stumbled at the very threshold. In the text under consideration our Lord mentions two things, the *new-birth* and the *kingdom of God*. These two your imagination blended into one: in consequence of which you run on with “born into his kingdom,” (a phrase never used by our Lord, nor any of his Apostles,) and a heap of other *crude expressions* of the same kind: all betraying that *confusedness of thought*, which alone could prevent your usual clearness of language.

Just in the same manner you go on. “Our first parents in Paradise were to form their minds to an habitual subjection to the law of God, without which they could not be received into his spiritual kingdom.” (p. 252, 253.) This runs upon the same mistaken supposition, that God *could not create them* holy. Certainly he could and did: and from the very moment that they were created, their minds were in subjection to the law of God, and they were members of his spiritual kingdom.

“But if Adam was originally perfect in holiness,” (say, *perfectly holy*, made in the moral image of God,) “what occasion was there for any farther trial?” That there might be room for farther holiness and happiness: entire holiness does not exclude growth: nor did the *right state* of all his faculties entitle him to that *full reward*, which would have followed the *right use* of them.

“Upon the whole, regeneration, or gaining habits of holiness, takes in no part of the doctrine of original sin.” (p. 254.) But regeneration is not “gaining habits of holiness:” it is quite a different thing. It is not a natural, but a supernatural change; and is just as different from the gradual “gaining habits,” as a child’s being *born* into the world is, from his *growing* up into a man. The *new-birth* is not, (as you suppose,) the *progress*, or the *whole* of sanctification, but the *beginning* of it; as the natural *birth* is not the *whole* of life, but only the entrance upon it. He that is born of a woman, then begins to live a natural life; he that is born of God, then begins to live a spiritual. And if every man born of a woman had spiritual life already, he would not need to be born of God.

“However, I allow the Spirit of God assists our endeavours. But this does not suppose any natural pravity of our minds.” (p. 255.) Does not his *quickening* then suppose we were *dead*? His *opening our eyes*, suppose we were *blind*? And his *creating us anew*, imply something more than the *assisting our endeavours*? How very slender a part in sanctification will you allow to the Spirit of God? You seem very fearful of doing him too much honour, of taking from *man* the glory due to his name!

Accordingly you say, “His aids are so far from supposing the previous inaptitude of our minds,” (to the being *born again*,) “that our previous desire of the Spirit’s assistance, is the condition of our receiving it.” But who gave us that desire? Is it not God ‘that worketh in us to will,’ to desire, as well as ‘to do?’ His grace does *accompany* and *follow* our desires: but does it not also *prevent*, go before them? After this, we may *ask* and *seek* farther assistance: and if we do, not otherwise, *it is given*.

I cannot but add a few words from Dr. Jennings. (Vind. p. 125.) “Dr. Taylor believes ‘the influence of the Spirit of God to assist our sincere endeavours, is spoken of in the gospel, but never as supposing any natural pravity of our minds.’ But certain it is, that Christ opposeth our being ‘born of the Spirit,’ to our being ‘born of the flesh: that which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.’ John iii. 6. Therefore the influence of the Spirit in regeneration, supposeth something that we are *born* with, which makes such an influence necessary to our being ‘born again.’ And if this be not some natural pravity, let our author tell us what it is. It is plain, it is not any ill habit afterward acquired; for it is something that we are *born* with. And if to be ‘born of the flesh,’ means only to have the parts and powers of a man: and if these parts and powers are all pure and uncorrupted, we have no need of any such influence of the Spirit, to be superadded to our natural powers. ‘Without this, our own sincere endeavours will suffice, for attaining all habits of virtue.’”

I proceed to your conclusion, “Is it not highly injurious to the God of our nature, whose hands have formed and fashioned us, to believe our nature is originally corrupted?” (p. 256.) It is: but the charge falls not on *us*, but *you*. We do not believe “our nature is originally corrupted.” It is *you* who believe this: who believe our nature to be in the same state, moral and intellectual, as it was *originally*. Highly injurious indeed is this supposition to the God of our nature. Did he originally give us such a nature as this? So like that of ‘a wild ass’s colt?’ So stupid, so stubborn, so intractable! So prone to evil! Averse to good! Did ‘his hands form and fashion us thus?’ No wiser or better than men at present are? If I believed this, that men were *originally* what they are now; if you could once convince me of this, I could not go so far as to be a Deist: I must either be a Manichee, or an Atheist. I must either believe, there was an evil God, or that there was no God at all.

“But to disparage our nature is to disparage the work and gifts of God.” (p. 257.) True: but to describe the corruption of our nature as it is, is not disparaging the work of God. For that corruption is not his work. On the other hand, to say it is, to say God created us as corrupt as we are now, with as weak an understanding and as perverse a will: this is disparaging the work of God, and God himself to some purpose!

“But doth not this doctrine teach you to transfer your wickedness and sin to a wrong cause? Whereas you ought to blame yourself alone, you lay the whole blame upon Adam.” (p. 258.) I do not. I know God is willing to save me from all sin, both original and actual. Therefore if I am not saved, I must lay the whole blame upon myself.

“But what good end does this doctrine promote?” The doctrine, that we are by nature, ‘dead in sin,’ and therefore ‘children of wrath,’ promotes repentance, a true knowledge of ourselves, and thereby leads to faith in Christ, to a true knowledge of Christ crucified. And faith worketh love; and by love, all holiness both of heart

and life.. Consequently, this doctrine promotes (nay, and is absolutely, indispensably necessary to promote) the whole of that religion which the Son of God lived and died to establish.

“ We are told indeed, that it promotes humility. But neither our Lord, nor his Apostles, when inculcating humility, say a word about natural corruption.” Supposing (not granting) that they did not, yet it cannot be, in the very nature of the thing, that any whose nature is corrupt should be humble, should know himself, without knowing that corruption.

“ But what can be more destructive to virtue, than to represent sin as altogether unavoidable ?” (p. 259.) This does not follow from the doctrine. Corrupt as we are, through Almighty grace we may avoid all sin.

But it is destructive of virtue. For “ if we believe we are by nature worse than the brutes, what wonder if we act worse than brutes ?” Yea, if we are so, what wonder if we act so ! And this it is absolutely certain men do, whether they believe one way or the other. For they who do not believe this, live no better than those that do. Therefore if “ the generality of Christians have been the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous of all mankind,” it is not owing to this belief. But in truth they have not been so ; neither are they at this day. The generality of Christians, so called, are perhaps but little better, yet surely they are no worse, either in tempers or actions, than the rest of mankind. The generality of Jews, yea, of Turks and Pagans, are full as “ lewd, bloody, and treacherous ” as they.

You go on, “ It is surprising, that Christians ” (you mean, those of them who believe original sin) “ have lost even a sense of the beneficence of God, in giving them a rational nature.” (p. 260.) Nay, surely Christians have lost that rational nature itself, or they retain it to very little purpose, if “ the generality of them are the most wicked, lewd, bloody, and treacherous, of all mankind !” They ought “ to be humbled,” for yielding to those evil propensities, which through the grace of God they may conquer. And they who do conquer, ought to be continually “ thanking God,” for this and all his benefits.

With great decency you proceed, “ Who can believe that to be a revelation from God, which teacheth so absurd a doctrine ? I make no doubt this with other like principles, have filled our land with Infidels.” However, the gentlemen who disclaim these absurd principles, of *original sin*, *redemption*, and *regeneration*, may very easily convert those Infidels : since there is scarcely any room for contention left between them.

“ Is not this doctrine hurtful to the power of godliness, as it diverts men from the heavenly and substantial truths of religion ?” (p. 261.) Just the reverse. There is no possibility of the power of godliness without it. The power of godliness consists in the love of God and man : This is heavenly and substantial religion. But no man can possibly ‘ love his neighbour as himself,’ till he loves God. And no man can possibly love God till he truly believes in Christ, till he is deeply convinced of his own sinfulness, guiltiness, and helplessness,

But this no man ever was, neither can be, who does not know he has a corrupt nature.

This doctrine therefore is the “most proper” of all others, “to be instilled into a child:” that it is by nature a *child of wrath*, under the guilt and under the power of sin: that it can be saved from wrath, only by the merits, and sufferings, and love of the Son of God: that it can be delivered from the power of sin, only by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit: but that by his grace it may be renewed in the image of God, perfected in love, and made meet for glory.

But “must it not lessen the due love of parents to children, to believe they are the vilest creatures in the world?” (p. 262, 263.) Far from it; if they know how God loves both them and their’s, vile and sinful as they are. And it is a certain fact, that no parents love their children more tenderly, than those who firmly believe this doctrine: and that none are more careful to ‘bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

But “how can young people remember their Creator without horror, if he has given them life under such deplorable circumstances?” They can remember him with pleasure, with earnest thankfulness, when they reflect *out of* what a *pit* he hath *brought them up*: and that if *sin abounded*, both by nature and habit, *grace did much more abound*.

You conclude, “Why should we subject our consciences to tales and fables, invented by priests and monks?” (p. 264.) This fable, as you term it, of original sin, could not be invented by Romish priests or monks: because it is by many ages older than either; yea, than Christianity itself.

I have now weighed, as my leisure would permit, all the arguments advanced in your three parts. And this I have done with continual prayer, that I might know the truth as it is in Jesus. But still I see no ground to alter my sentiments, touching the general corruption of human nature. Nor can I find any better or any other way, of accounting for that general wickedness, which has prevailed in all nations, and through all ages, nearly from the beginning of the world to this day.

LEWISHAM, Jan. 25, 1757.

PART III.

AN ANSWER TO DR. TAYLOR’S SUPPLEMENT

YOU subjoin to your book a very large SUPPLEMENT, in answer to Dr. Jennings and Dr. Watts. All that they have advanced, I am not engaged to defend; but such parts only as affect the merits of the cause.

You divide this part of your work into eight sections. The first treats

OF IMPUTED GUILT.

And here you roundly affirm, "No action is said in Scripture to be imputed to any person for righteousness or condemnation, but the *proper act and deed* of that person."*

Were then the *iniquities and sins* which were put upon the scape-goat, his own *proper act and deed*? You answer, "Here was no imputation of sin to the goat. It was only a figurative way of signifying the removal of guilt, from the penitent Israelites, by the goat's going into the wilderness." But how could it be a *figure* of any such thing, if no *guilt* was *imputed* to him?

"Aaron is commanded, to 'put the iniquities of Israel' upon the scape-goat. (Lev. xvi. 21.) And this goat is said to 'bear the iniquities of the people' (ver. 22.) This was plainly an imputation. et it could not possibly be an imputation of any thing done by the animal itself. The effects also which took place upon the execution of the ordinance indicate a translation of guilt. For the congregation was cleansed, but the goat was polluted. The congregation so cleansed, that their iniquities were borne away, and to be found no more: the goat so polluted, that it communicated defilement to the person who conducted it into a land not inhabited."

In truth the scape-goat was a figure of him, 'on whom the Lord laid the iniquities of us all.' (Isa. liii. 6.) 'He bore our iniquity!' (ver. 11.) 'He bare the sin of many.' (ver. 12.) The Prophet uses three different words in the original: of which the first does properly signify the *meeting together*; the last, the *lifting up* a weight or burden. This burden it was which made him 'sweat as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground.' "But iniquity and sin sometimes signify suffering." (p. 8, 9.) Yes; *suffering for sin*; the effect being put for the cause. Accordingly what we mean by, 'our sins were imputed to him,' is, he was punished for them; 'he was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities.' He 'who knew no sin,' but what was thus imputed, 'was made sin,' a sin offering for us: "It pleased the Lord" (your own words) "to bruise him, in order to the expiation of our sins." (p. 10, 11.)

"But with regard to parents and their posterity, God assures us children 'shall not die for the iniquity of their fathers.'" No, not eternally. I believe none ever did or ever will die eternally, merely for the sin of our first father.

"But the Scripture never speaks of imputing any sin to any person, but what is the act of that person." (p. 13, 14.) It was but now you yourself observed, that by "our sins were imputed to Christ," we mean, "He suffered for them." Our sins then were imputed to Christ. And yet these sins were not the act of the person that suffered. He did not commit the sin which was thus imputed to him.

But "no just constitution can punish the innocent." (p. 16.) This is undoubtedly true. Therefore God does not look upon infants as innocent, but as involved in the *guilt* of Adam's sin. Otherwise

* Supplement, p. 7.

death, the *punishment* denounced against that sin, could not be inflicted upon them.

“ It is allowed the posterity of Ham and Gehazi, and the children of Dathan and Abiram, suffered for the sins of their parents.” It is enough. You need allow no more. All the world will see, if they *suffered* for them, then they were *punished* for them. Yet we do not “ confound punishment with suffering, as if to suffer and to be punished, were the same thing.” *Punishment* is not barely *suffering*, but *suffering for sin*: To *suffer* and to be *punished*, are not the same thing. But to *suffer for sin*, and to be *punished* are precisely the same.

If therefore the children of Dathan and Abiram *suffered for the sins* of their parents, which no man can deny, then they were punished for them. Consequently it is not true, that “ in the instances alleged, the parents only were punished by the sufferings of the children.” If the children *suffered for those sins*, then they were punished for them. Indeed sometimes the parents too were punished, by the sufferings of their children; which is all that your heap of quotations proves: and sometimes they were not. But however this were; if the children *suffered for their sins*, they were punished for them.

It is not therefore “ evident, that in all these cases, children are considered not as criminals, involved in guilt, but as the enjoyments of their parents who alone are *punished* by their sufferings.” (p. 18.) On the contrary, it is very evident that the children of Canaan were *punished* for the sin of Ham; and that the children of Dathan and Abiram were punished with death, as “ involved in the guilt of their parents.”

“ On the other hand, the virtues of an ancestor may convey great advantages to his posterity. But no man’s posterity can be rewarded for their ancestor’s virtue.” (p. 21.) The point here in dispute between Dr. Watts and you, is whether the thing, concerning which you agreed, should be expressed by one term or another? You both agree, (and no man in his senses can deny) that in all ages, God has, on account of pious ancestors, given many blessing to their offspring. But he thinks, these blessings should be termed rewards, (and so do all the world;) you say, they should not. The fact is plain either way; God does continually, and he did in all ages, give numberless blessings to the children, on account of the piety of their fathers. And it is certain, blessings given on account of virtue, have been hitherto termed rewards both by God and man.

You conclude this section, “ Thus it appears, the distinction between personal sin and imputed guilt, is without any ground in Scripture.” (p. 22.) Just the contrary appears, namely, that guilt was imputed to the scape-goat, to the children of wicked parents, and to our blessed Lord himself, without any *personal sin*. The distinction therefore is sound and scriptural.

SECT. II.

Of the Nature and Design of our Afflictions and Mortality.

THAT God designs to bring good out of these is certain. But does this prove, they have not the *nature* of *punishments*? Did Adam himself suffer any *affliction*? Any toil or pain? Doubtless, he did, long before he returned to dust. And can we doubt, but he received spiritual good from that pain? Yet it was a *punishment* still: as really such, as if it had consigned him over to everlasting punishment. This argument therefore is of no weight: "God draws good out of punishments: therefore they are no punishments at all." However, then, the sufferings wherein Adam's sin has involved his whole posterity, may "try and purify us, in order to future and everlasting happiness," (p. 23,) this circumstance does not alter their nature: they are punishments still.

Let "afflictions, calamities, and death itself, be means of improving in virtue," (p. 24,) of healing or preventing sin, this is no manner of proof, that they are not punishments. Was not God able to heal or prevent sin, without either pain or death? Could not the Almighty have done this, as easily, as speedily, and as effectually, without these as with them? Why then did he not? Why did Adam's sin bring these on his whole posterity? Why should one man suffer for another man's fault? If you say, to cure his own; I ask, 1. What necessity was there of any suffering at all for this? If God intended only to cure his sin, he could have done that without any suffering. I ask, 2. Why do infants suffer? What sin have they to be cured thereby? If you say, "It is to heal the sin of their parents, who sympathize and suffer with them:" in a thousand instances this has no place: the parents are not the better, nor any way likely to be the better, for all the sufferings of their children. Their sufferings therefore, yea, and those of all mankind, which are entailed upon them by the sin of Adam, are not the result of mere *mercy* but of *justice* also. In other words, they have in them the nature of punishments, even on us and on our children. Therefore children themselves are not innocent before God. They suffer, therefore they deserve to suffer.

And here another question arises; What benefit accrues to the brute creation, from the sufferings wherein their whole race is involved through the sin of the first man? The fact cannot be denied, daily experience attests what we read in the oracles of God, that 'the whole creation groaneth and travaleth in pain to this day,' a considerable part of it groans to God, under the wantonness or cruelty of man. Their sufferings are caused, or at least greatly increased, by our luxury or inhumanity: nay, and by our *diversions*! We draw entertainment from the pain, the death of other creatures: not to mention several entire species, which at present have such na-

tural qualities, that we are obliged to inflict pain, nay, perhaps death upon them, purely in our own defence. And even those species which are out of the reach of men, are not out of the reach of suffering. ‘The lions do lack and suffer hunger,’ though they are as it were sovereigns of the plain. Do they not acknowledge this, when ‘roaring for their prey,’ they ‘seek their meat from God?’ And what shall we say of their helpless prey? Is not their lot more miserable still? Now what benefits, I say, have these from their sufferings? Are they also “tried and purified thereby?” Do sufferings “correct their inordinate passions, and dispose their minds to sober reflections?” Do they “give them opportunity of exercising kindness and compassion, in relieving each other’s distresses?” That I know not: but I know by this and a thousand proofs, that when man, the lord of the visible creation, rebelled against God, every part of the creation began to *suffer on account of his sin*. And to *suffering on account of sin*, I can give no properer name than that of *punishment*.

“It was to reclaim offenders, that an extraordinary power was exercised, either immediately by our Lord himself, or by his apostles, of inflicting bodily distempers, and in some cases death itself.” (p. 25.) I do not remember any more than one single case wherein one of the apostles “inflicted death.” I remember no instance recorded in Scripture, of their “inflicting bodily distempers.” (The blindness inflicted on Elimas cannot be so termed, without great impropriety,) and certain I am, that our Lord himself inflicted neither one nor the other.

The citations in the next page prove no more than that we may reap benefit from the *punishment* of others. (p. 26.) But though either we or they reap benefit from them, yet they are *punishments* still.

“We do not here consider death and suffering as they stand in the threatening of the law.” (p. 27.) You are sensible, if we did, all mankind must acknowledge them to be punishments. And this is the very light wherein we do and must consider them in the present question. We consider death and suffering, as they stand in that threatening, ‘Thou shalt surely die.’ That this was denounced to all mankind we know, because it is executed on all. Therefore, considering suffering and death as so *threatened* and *executed*, we cannot deny, that they are punishments: punishments not on Adam only, but on all that in fact do either *die* or *suffer*.

To sum up this point: although the wisdom and mercy of God do “bring good out of evil.” Although God *designs* to extract blessings from punishments, and does it in numberless instances: yet this does not alter the nature of things, but punishments are punishments still: still this name properly belongs to all sufferings, which are *inflicted on account of sin*: and, consequently, it is an evident truth, that the whole animate creation is *punished* for Adam’s sin.

SECT. III.

The Argument taken from the Calamities and Sinfulness of Mankind, considered.

“THE subject of our present inquiry is three-fold. 1. Whether mankind be under God’s displeasure, antecedently to their actual sins? 2. Whether our nature be corrupt, from the beginning of life? And, 3. Whether these propositions can be proved from the *calamities and sinfulness of mankind?*” (p. 30, 31.)

Whether they can or not, they have been fully proved from Scripture. Let us now inquire, if they may not be proved from the state of the world.

But you think, Dr. Watts “has here laid too great stress on supposition and imagination.” In proof of which you cite from him the following words: “Can we suppose that the blessed God would place his innocent creatures in such a dangerous habitation? Can we suppose, that among the roots, and the herbs, and the trees, which are good for food, the great God would have suffered deadly poison to spring up here and there? Would there have been any such creatures in our world as bears and tigers? Can we ever imagine the great and good God would have appointed men to be propagated in such a way, as would necessarily give such exquisite pain and anguish to the mothers that produce them, if they had been all accounted in his eyes, a race of holy and sinless beings?” (p. 31.)

I answer, It is not true, “that too great stress,” or any stress at all, is “here laid on *mere* supposition and imagination.” Your catching at those two words, *suppose* and *imagine*, will by no means prove it. For the meaning of them is plain. “Can we suppose the blessed God would do this?” is manifestly the same with, “How can we reconcile it with his essential attributes?” In like manner, “Can we ever *imagine*?” is equivalent with, “Can we possibly conceive?” So that the occasional use of these words does not infer his laying any stress on supposition and imagination. When, therefore, you add, “our *suppositions* and *imaginings* are not a just standard by which to measure the divine dispensations,” (p. 32,) what you say is absolutely true, but absolutely foreign to the point.

Some of the questions which you yourself ask, to expose his, it is not so easy to answer. “Would innocent creatures have been thrust into the world in so contemptible circumstances? And have been doomed to grow up so slowly to maturity and the use of reason? Would they when grown up have been constrained to spend so much time in low and servile labour? Would millions have been obliged to spend all their days, from early morn till evening, in hewing stone, sawing wood, heaving, rubbing, or beating the limb of an oak, or a bar of iron?” (p. 33.) I really think, they would not. I believe

all this toil as well as the pain and anguish of women in child-birth, is an evidence of the fall of man, of the sin of our first parents, and part of the *punishment* denounced and executed first on them, and then on all their posterity.

You add, “He doth not consider this world as a state of trial, but as if it ought to have been a seat of happiness.” (p. 34, 35.) There is no contrariety between these: it might be a state of trial, and of happiness too. And such it certainly was to Adam in Paradise: whether he was holy or not, he was undoubtedly happy. A state of trial therefore does not necessarily imply any kind or degree of natural evil. And accordingly the Creator himself assures us, there was none originally in his creation. For so I read at the conclusion of it, ‘And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold, it was very good.’ (Gen. i. 31.)

“But natural evil may be mixed with a state of trial. Consequently this world could not be built for a seat of happiness.” (p. 36.) Admirable drawing of consequences! “If *may be* :” therefore it *could not* be otherwise. Whatever *may be*, God himself here tells us, *what was*. And from his own declaration, it is infallibly certain, there was no *natural evil* in the world, till it entered as the punishment of *sin*.

“Neither doth he take a future state into his representation.” (p. 36.) No, nor is there any need he should, when he is representing the present state of the world, as a *punishment* of Adam’s sin. “Nor doth he take into his argument the goodness of God.” (p. 37.) Not into *this* argument: that is of after consideration. So the texts you have heaped together on this head also, are very good. But what do they prove?

“He supposes our sufferings to be mere punishments.” I suppose, they are *punishments* mixed with mercy. But still they are *punishments*: they are *evils inflicted on account of sin*.

“We find, in fact, that the best of men may be made *very unhappy*, by calamities and oppressions.” (p. 39.) It cannot be. The *best of men* cannot be made unhappy by any calamities or oppressions whatsoever. For they ‘have learned, in every’ possible ‘state, therewith to be content.’ In spite of all calamities, they ‘rejoice evermore, and in every thing give thanks.’

“From punishments inflicted on particular persons, he infers that all men are under the wrath of God. But to infer the state of the whole from the case of some, is not a fair way of arguing.” (p. 40.) No. The punishments inflicted on particular persons prove nothing, but with regard to those on whom they are inflicted. If, therefore, *some men* only suffer and die, this proves nothing with regard to the rest. But if *the whole* of mankind suffer and die, then the conclusion reaches *all men*.

“He is not quite just, in pronouncing the present form of the earth, ‘irregular, abrupt, and horrid;’ and asking, ‘Doth it not bear strongly on our sight, the ideas of ruin and confusion, in vast broken mountains, dreadful cliffs and precipices, immense extents of waste.

and barren ground?" (p. 41.) If this be the case, how can 'the invisible things of God be clearly seen from' 'such a ruined creation?' Perfectly well. 'His eternal power and Godhead,' the existence of a *powerful* and *eternal* Being may still be inferred from these his works, grand and magnificent, though in ruin. Consequently, these leave the Atheist without excuse. And whatever objections he might form (as Lucretius actually does) from these palpable blemishes and irregularities of the terraqueous globe, the scriptural account of *natural*, flowing from *moral* evil, will easily and perfectly solve them. All which is well consistent with the words of the Psalmist, 'O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches!' So undoubtedly it is, though it bears so visible signs of *ruin* and *devastation*.

"We have no authority from Scripture, to say that the earth, in its present constitution, is at all different from what it was at its first creation." Certainly we have, if the Scripture affirms, that God said, after Adam sinned, 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee,' and, 'that the earth was of old, standing out of the water, and in the water,' till God destroyed it for the sin of its inhabitants.

You go on. "I cannot agree, that disease, anguish, and death, have entered into the bowels and veins of multitudes, by an innocent and fatal mistake, of pernicious plants and fruits for proper food." (p. 43.) Why not? Doubtless *multitudes* also have perished hereby, if we take in the account of all ages and nations: *multitudes* also have been the living prey, of bears and tigers, wolves and lions: and *multitudes* have had their flesh and bones crushed and churned between the jaws of panthers and leopards, sharks, and crocodiles. And would these things have come upon mankind, were it not on account of Adam's sin?

Yet you think, we have "now a more extensive dominion over all creatures, than Adam had even in his innocence; because we have the liberty of eating them; which Adam never had." (p. 44.) This will not prove the point. That I have the liberty to eat a *lamb*, does not prove that I have dominion over a *lion*. Certainly I have not dominion over any creature which I can neither *govern* nor *resist*: yea, and if the *dread* of me is on every *beast and fowl*, this does not prove, that I have any *dominion* over them. I know, on the contrary, that not only a tiger or a bear, but even a dove will not stoop to my dominion.

"However, we have no authority to say, man himself was cursed, though the ground was." (p. 46.) Yes, we have: the authority of God himself, 'Cursed is every man that continueth not in all things' which God hath commanded. The moment therefore that he sinned, Adam fell under this curse. And whether the *toil* and *death* to which he and his posterity were sentenced, and the *pain of childbirth* be termed *curse*s or not, sure it is they are *punishments*, and *heavy ones* too, though *mercy* is often mixed with *judgment*.

The main argument follows, taken from the state of mankind in general, with regard to religion. But you say, "It is impossible we should make a just estimate of the wickedness of mankind :" (p. 51.) Yes, an *exactly* just estimate of the *precise* degree of wickedness in the whole world. But it is very possible, nay, very easy, to make an estimate in the gross, with such a degree of justness as suffices for the present question.

Indeed you "think we carry our censures of the Heathens too far." I dare not carry them so far, as to say, no Heathen shall be saved. But this I say: I never knew any Heathen yet, (and I have personally known many out of various nations,) who was not a slave to some gross vice or other. Bad therefore as nominal Christians are, I cannot yet place them on a level with the Heathens: not even with the mild, courteous, conversable Heathens, who border on Georgia and Carolina. Much less would I say, "possibly the Heathens may be *less vicious* than the Christian world in general." If I believed this, I should bid adieu to Christianity, and commence Heathen without delay.

"But if we allow mankind to be ever so wicked, suppose there is not one upon earth, who is truly righteous; it will not follow that men are naturally corrupt: for a sinful action does not infer a sinful nature. If it does, then Adam brought a sinful nature with him into the world. But if we cannot infer from Adam's sin, that his nature was originally corrupt, neither can we infer from the wickedness of all mankind, be it ever so great, that they have a sinful nature." (p. 52, 53.)

The consequence is not good. "If one man's committing a sin does not prove that he was naturally inclined to evil, then the wickedness of all mankind for six thousand years, will not prove that they are naturally inclined to evil." For we may easily account for one man's committing sin, though he was not naturally inclined to evil: but not so easily, for 'all flesh corrupting themselves,' for the wickedness of all mankind in all ages. It is not possible rationally to account for this, for the general wickedness of mankind; for such a majority of men through all generations being so corrupt, but on the supposition of their having a corrupt nature. Sin in one or a few cases, does not prove a sinful nature: but sin overspreading the earth, does. Nor is your argument drawn from the sin of the angels, (p. 54, 55.) of any more force than that drawn from the sin of Adam: unless you can prove that as great a majority of angels as of men, have rebelled against their Creator.

"Again. If our first parents felt fear and shame, and yet their nature was not originally corrupt, then it will not follow, that ours is so notwithstanding our uneasy and unruly passions." Empty sound! Had any one said to Adam, "Your nature was originally corrupt, for you feel uneasy and unruly passions :" would he not readily have answered, but these began at such an hour; till then my nature was without either pain or corruption. Apply this to any child of Adam: and if he can answer in like manner, "till such an hour

no uneasy or unruly passion had any place in my breast :" we will then grant, these passions no more prove a corrupt nature in the sons than in their first father. But no man can answer thus. You, and I, and every man, must acknowledge, that uneasy and unruly passions, are coeval with our understanding and memory at least, if not with our very being.

" Again. Adam by his sin brought sufferings on himself and his posterity. Yet it does not follow, that his nature was corrupt. Therefore, though others by their sins bring sufferings on themselves and their posterity, it will not follow that their nature is corrupt, or under the displeasure of God." Two very different things are here blended together. The corruption of their nature is one thing, the displeasure of God another. None affirms, that those sufferings which men by their sins bring on themselves or posterity prove that their nature is corrupt. But do not the various sufferings of all mankind, prove that they are under the displeasure of God ? It is certain no suffering came upon Adam, till he was under the displeasure of God.

" Again. If our first parents by their sin brought suffering both on themselves and others, and yet their nature was not originally corrupt, nor under the displeasure of God: it clearly follows, that the nature of those who suffer purely in consequence of their sin, is not originally corrupt, nor are they under God's displeasure." This argument is bad every way. For, 1. at the time when Adam brought the sentence of suffering both on himself and others, his nature was corrupt, and he was under the actual displeasure of God. But, 2. Suppose it were otherwise, all you could possibly infer, with regard to his posterity, is, that their suffering does not prove their corruption, or their being under the displeasure of God. How could you think, their suffering would prove them *not corrupt*? *Not* under God's displeasure ? Therefore neither this nor the preceding argument, (seeing both are utterly inconclusive) " take off any thing that Dr. Watts has said," touching the present state of the world, as a proof of God's displeasure, and the natural corruption of man. So far, therefore, is " his argument from the sinfulness and misery of mankind from being altogether insufficient in every part ;" that it is strong and conclusive, any thing you have advanced to the contrary notwithstanding.

You add, " Suffering may happen where there is no sin, as in the case of brutes and infants : or where there is the most perfect innocence ; as in the case of our blessed Lord." Absolutely true : that is, where there is no *personal sin*, but only *sin imputed*. There was no *personal sin* in our blessed Lord : there can be none either in brutes or infants. He suffered, therefore, for the sins of others, which were thus *imputed* to him : as is the sin of Adam to infants, who suffer death through him, and in some sense to the whole creation ; which was 'made subject to vanity, not willingly,' but on account of his transgression. But where there is no sin, either personal or imputed, there can be no suffering.

“ I may add, from the present state of things a directly opposite argument may be taken ; from the enjoyments and comforts, the good things and blessings, which abound in the world. I might ask, are these creatures so well provided for under God’s displeasure ? Are they not the care of his goodness ? Does he not love them, and delight to do them good ?” (p. 58—61.) I answer, God does still give us many good things, many enjoyments, comforts, and blessings. But all these are given through ‘ the Seed of the woman :’ they are all the purchase of his blood. Through him we are still the care of the divine goodness, and God does delight to do us good. But this does not at all prove, either that we have not a sinful nature, or that we are not, while sinful, under his displeasure.



SECT. IV.

Some Consequences of the Doctrine of Original Sin.

“ BY this doctrine some have been led to maintain, 1. That men have not a sufficient power to perform their duty. But if so, it ceases to be their duty.” (p. 63—69.) I maintain, that men have not this power by nature. But they have or may have it by grace, therefore it does not cease to be their duty. And if they perform it not, they are without excuse.

“ Hence some maintain, 2. That we have no reason to thank our Creator for our being.” (p. 70—73.) He that will maintain it, may. But it does by no means follow from this doctrine : since whatever we are by nature, we may by grace be children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven.

“ But unthankfulness is a natural consequence of this doctrine, which greatly diminishes, if not totally excludes the goodness and mercy of God.” (p. 74.) St. Paul thought otherwise. He imagined the total ungodliness and impotence of our nature, to be the very thing which most of all illustrated the goodness and mercy of God. ‘ For a good man,’ says he, ‘ peradventure one would even dare to die. But God commendeth,’ unspeakably, inconceivably, beyond all human precedent, ‘ his love to us, in that while we were yet without strength Christ died for the ungodly.’ Here is the ground, the real and the *only* ground for true Christian thankfulness. ‘ Christ died for the ungodly that were without strength :’ such as is every man by nature. And till a man has been deeply sensible of it, he can never truly thank God for his redemption ; nor, consequently, for his creation, which is in the event a blessing to those only who are created anew in Christ Jesus.”

“ Hence, 3. Some have poured great contempt upon human nature ; whereas God himself does not despise mankind, but thinks them worthy of his highest regards.” (p. 75.) To describe human nature as deeply fallen, as far removed both from virtue and wisdom,

does not argue that we despise it. We know by Scripture as well as by sad experience, that men are now unspeakably foolish and wicked. And such the Son of God knew them to be, when he laid down his life for them. But this did not hinder him from loving them, no more than it does any of the children of God.

You next consider what Dr. Watts observes with regard to infants. (p. 77—82.) ‘Mankind,’ says he, ‘in its younger years, before it is capable of proper moral action, discovers the principles of iniquity, and the seeds of sin. What young ferments of spite and envy, what native malice and rage are found in the little hearts of infants, and sufficiently discovered by their little hands and eyes, and their wrathful countenance even before they can speak?’ You answer, “Our Lord gave us different ideas of them when he taught his apostles to become ‘as little children.’” Not at all. They may be imitable in some respects, and yet have all the tempers above described. And it is certain they have; as any impartial observer will be convinced by his own eyes. Nor is this any way contradicted by St. Paul’s words, *In wickedness, (κακίᾳ,) be ye children: 1 Cor. xiv. 20,* untaught, unexperienced: or by those of David, *My soul is even as a weaned child.* Psalm cxxxii. 2.

“But we discover in them also the noble principles of reason and understanding, with several tempers which are capable of improvement, whereby they may be trained up in a good way: and numbers in all ages of the world have risen to very considerable degrees of excellence.” All this is true: but it is not at all inconsistent with the account of them given above: by which it clearly appears, that they are strongly inclined to evil, long before any ill habits can be contracted.

SECT. V

A general Argument, taken from what God has declared concerning Mankind, at the Restoration of the World after the Deluge.

“**T**HREE are three passages from which divines infer the excellency of Adam’s state and nature above our’s: I. Gen. i. 28. ‘And God blessed them and said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.’” (p. 84.) With this I have nothing to do: for I infer nothing from it, with regard to the present question. II. “‘Have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.’” III. Gen. i. 27 ‘God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.’ From these three particulars they deduce the superiority of Adam’s nature above our’s. But the very same marks of excellency are more expressly pronounced by God upon the human nature, when the race of mankind was to be propagated anew from Noah and his sons.” (p. 85.)

I. Gen. ix. 1. ‘And God blessed Noah and his sons.’ With regard to this whole passage, I must observe, That God did not pronounce any blessing at all, either on him or them, till ‘Noah had built an altar unto the Lord, and had offered burnt-offerings on the altar.’ Then it was that the Lord *smelled a sweet savour*; accepted the sacrifice which implied faith in the promised Seed, and for his sake restored in some measure the blessing which he had given to Adam at his creation. ‘And said be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.’ On this I need only observe, had Adam stood, or had not his fall affected his posterity, there would have been no need of this: for they would have *multiplied and replenished the earth* in virtue of the original blessing.

II. Ver. 2. ‘The fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moveth upon the earth: into your hands they are delivered: every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you all things.’ On this likewise I would observe, What need was there of any such power over the creatures to be given to man, if he had not forfeited his former power? Had man remained subject to God, the creatures would have remained subject to him, by virtue of God’s original constitution. And why was it, but because man had lost this power, that God here in some degree restores it?

But hence you “infer, that all that power is restored, yea, more than all: that we have a more extensive dominion granted to us over the brutal world, than was originally given to Adam.” (p. 86.) It has been commonly thought, that Adam had full dominion over the creatures subject to him by a kind of instinct: whereas we have only so far power over them, that by labour and vigilance we may use or subdue them. But how do you prove that we have a fuller dominion than we had? By those words, ‘The fear and dread of you shall be upon all: into your hands they are delivered: even as the green herb have I given you all things.’ Nay, ‘the fear and the dread of you shall be upon them,’ does not imply any dominion at all. A wolf may fear me, who yet does not *obey* me. I *dread* a viper, but I do not *obey* it. And those words, *into your hands they are delivered*, are plainly equivalent with ‘I have given you all things, even as the green herb; namely for food;’ you may feed on any of them. So far, therefore, is this text from *expressly pronouncing a more extensive dominion* given to Noah over the brutal world than was originally given to Adam, that it does not express any proper dominion at all.

III. Ver. 6. ‘Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed. For in the image of God made he man,’ namely, at the creation. And some remains of the natural image of God, as we are spiritual and immortal beings, are even now to be found in every man, sufficient to justify the putting a murderer to death. St. James alludes to the same scriptures, when he says, “Therewith bless we God and curse men, who were made (*τες γενοντας*) not *are made*, after the similitude of God.” Jam. iii. 9. But what does all this

prove? That the being ‘created in the image of God,’ “is more expressly pronounced upon Noah and his sons, than it was originally on Adam?” I think no man of sense will say this in cool blood.

Of “the three particulars,” then, which you brought to prove the superiority of Noah over Adam in innocence, the first proves no more than that God gave both the blessing of fruitfulness: the second far from proving that Noah had a more extensive dominion over the brute creation than Adam, hardly proves that he had any dominion over them at all; and the third proves only this, that the image of God wherein man was made at first, is not totally lost now.

Yet you say, “these three particulars contain all the privileges conferred on Adam at first. And every one of these is expressly repeated, and more emphatically and extensively pronounced upon man, after the judgment passed on Adam had come upon his posterity.” (p. 87.) *Expressly? More emphatically? More extensively? Where?* I am sure not in the Bible.

However, you pompously add (*sicut tuus est mos*) “This is to me a clear and undoubted demonstration.”

I. “That ‘the judgment which came upon all men to condemnation,’ did no ways alter the primary relation in which God stood to man, and man to God.” Certainly it was altered thus far, God was a *condemner*, and man was condemned. And though “God is still the God and Father of mankind,” yet it cannot be said that he is so to unregenerate men, men who are as yet ‘dead in sin and children of wrath,’ “as much” or in the same sense “as he was to Adam in innocence.” Adam then was surely *the son of God*, as no other man is, till *born of the Spirit*. The power to become the sons of God is now given to none, till they *believe on his Name*.

II. “That the love, regards, and providence of God toward mankind in general, are still the very same as to man at his first formation.” (p. 88.)

His *providence* is still over all his works. But he cannot *regard* or *delight* in *sinful* man, in the *very same* manner wherein he delighted in him when *innocent*.

III. “That our nature as derived from Noah has just the same endowments, natural and moral, with which Adam was created.” This does not follow from any thing that has yet been said. If it stands of itself, it may

IV. “That whatever came upon us from ‘the judgment to condemnation,’ came no farther than was consistent with that blessing, pronounced upon Noah as well as Adam, ‘Be fruitful and multiply.’” This is undoubtedly true. Otherwise the human species could not have been continued. “So that the ‘condemnation which came upon all men’ cannot infer the wrath of God upon mankind.”—It *may*, notwithstanding that they *increase and multiply*: it *must*, if they are ‘by nature children of wrath’:—“but only as subjecting us to such evils, as were perfectly consistent with his blessing, declared to Adam, as soon as he came out of his Maker’s hands.” (p. 89.)—Namely, with the blessing, *Increase and multiply*.—“And conse-

quently ! To such evils as God might justly have subjected mankind to, before Adam sinned."—Whether God could justly have done this, or not, what a consequence is this ? " If God gave that blessing, ' Increase and multiply,' to men in general, as well as he did to Adam, then men in general are not ' children of wrath' now, any more than Adam was at his creation."

V " It is no less evident, that when St. Paul says, ' By the disobedience of one, many (or all) were made sinners,' he cannot mean, they were made sinners in any sense inconsistent with the blessing pronounced on man in innocence." True ; not in any sense inconsistent with that blessing, ' Increase and multiply.' But this blessing is no way inconsistent with their being ' by nature children of wrath.'

" From all which I conclude, that our state with regard to the blessing of God, and the dignity and faculties of our nature, (unless debased by our own sins,) is not inferior to that in which Adam was created." (p. 90—93.) Be this so, or not, it cannot be concluded from any thing that has gone before. But we may still believe, that men in general are ' fallen short of the glory of God,' are deprived of that glorious image of God, wherein man was originally created.



SECT. VI.

The Notion of Adam's being a federal Head, or Representative of Mankind, considered.

MY reason for believing he was so in some sense is this. Christ was the *Representative* of mankind, when God ' laid on him the iniquities of us all, and he was wounded for our transgressions.' But Adam was a type or *figure* of Christ. Therefore he was also in some sense our *representative*. In consequence of which ' all died in him, as in Christ all shall be made alive.'

But as neither *representative* nor *federal head*, are scripture-words, it is not worth while to contend for them. The thing I mean is this: the state of all mankind did so far depend on Adam, that by his fall they all fall into sorrow, and pain, and death spiritual and temporal. And all this is no ways inconsistent, with either the justice or goodness of God, provided all may recover through the Second Adam whatever they lost through the first. Nay, and recover it with unspeakable gain: since every additional temptation they feel, by that corruption of their nature, which is antecedent to their choice, will, if conquered by grace, be a mean of adding to that ' exceeding and eternal weight of glory.'

This single consideration totally removes all reflections on the Divine Justice or Mercy, in making the state of all mankind, so dependent on the behaviour of their common parent. For not one child of man finally loses thereby, unless by his own choice. And every one who receives the grace of God in Christ, will be an unspeak-

able gainer. Who then has any reason to complain, even of having a nature inclined to evil? Seeing the more opportunities he has of fighting, the more of conquering: and seeing the greater is the difficulty of obtaining the victory, the brighter is the crown of glory.

But if Adam and Christ did not stand or fall, obey and suffer for mankind, how can the death of others be the consequence of Adam's offence: the life of others the consequence of Christ's obedience? How could all men be in any sense *constituted sinners* by the one, or *constituted righteous* by the other?

To explain this a little further in Mr. Hervey's words, "By *federal Head* or *Representative*, I mean what the apostle teaches, when he calls Christ *the Second Man*, and *the last Adam*. 1 Cor. xv. 47. The last? How? Not in a numerical sense: not in order of time: but in this respect, that as Adam was a public person, and acted in the stead of all mankind, so Christ likewise was a public person, and acted in behalf of all his people: that as Adam was the first general representative of mankind, Christ was the second and the last; (there never was, and never will be any other;) that what they severally did in this capacity, was not intended to *terminate* in themselves, but to affect as many as they severally represented."

"This does not rest on a single text, but is established again and again in the same chapter. The divinely wise apostle, foreseeing the prejudices which men would entertain against this doctrine, as lying quite out of the road of reason's researches, has inculcated and re-inculcated this momentous point. 'Through the offence of one, many are dead:—the judgment was by one to condemnation:—by one man's offence death reigned by one:—by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.' And that there may remain no possibility of mistaking his meaning, or eluding his argument, he adds, 'By one man's disobedience many were made sinners.' All these expressions demonstrate, that Adam (as well as Christ) was a representative of all mankind. And that what he did in this capacity, did not *terminate* in himself, but affected all whom he represented."

After vehemently cavilling at the terms, you yourself allow the thing. You say, "If what was lost by the disobedience of one person, might afterwards be recovered by the obedience of another, then matters would have stood upon an equal footing:" (p. 113.) and this is indeed the truth. For "all that was lost to us by Adam's disobedience, is fully recovered by Christ's obedience: however we denominate the relation in which the one or the other stands to us."

In this we agree: but not in what follows. "By Law in the 5th of the Romans, as in several other places, the apostle does not mean barely a rule of duty; but such a rule, with the penalty of death threatened to every transgression of it. Such was the law given by Moses;" (p. 114, 115,) that is, "a rule, to every transgression of which the penalty of death was threatened." Not so: there were a thousand transgressions of it, to which death was not threatened. Observe: by death we now mean temporal death, according to the

whole tenor of your argument. "But is it not said, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them ?'" It is. But whatever this *curse* implied, it did not imply temporal death. For a man might neglect to do many *things written in the law*, and yet not be punishable with death.

Neither can I agree with your interpretation of Rom. vii. 9. "I was alive without the law once: namely, (p. 116,) before the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. The Jew was then alive: that is, because he was not then under the law, he was not slain by his sin. His sin was not so imputed to him as to subject him to death. 'But when the commandment came,' with the penalty of death annexed 'sin revived'—acquired full life and vigour:'—(How so? One would have expected just the contrary!) " 'and I died,' that is, was a dead man in law, upon the first transgression he committed." Beside many other objections to this strange interpretation, an obvious one is this, It supposes every transgression punishable with death. But this is a palpable mistake. Therefore all that is built on this foundation, falls to the ground at once.

Upon the whole: whatever objections may lie against Dr. Watts' method of explaining it, it appears from clear scripture and from your own words, that Adam was the representative of mankind.

SECT. VII.

Of the Formation of our Nature in the Womb.

BEFORE I say any thing on this head, I must premise, that there are a thousand circumstances relating to it, concerning which I can form no conception at all, but am utterly in the dark. I know not how my body was fashioned there; or when or how my soul was united to it. And it is far easier in speaking on so abstruse a subject, to pull down, than to build up. I can easily object to any hypothesis which is advanced: but I cannot easily defend any.

And if you ask me, How, in what determinate *manner* sin is propagated? How it is translated from father to son? I answer plainly, I cannot tell. No more than I can tell, How man is propagated? How a body is transmitted from father to son? I know both the one and the other fact. But I can account for neither.

Thus much however is plain, that "God is the maker of every man who comes into the world." (p. 138.) For, It is God alone who gives man power to propagate his species. Or rather, it is God himself who does the work, by man as an instrument: man (as you observed before) having no other part in producing man, than the oak has in producing an acorn. God is really the producer of every man, every animal, every vegetable in the world; as he is the true *primum mobile*, the spring of all motion through the universe. So far we agree. But when you subsume, "If it is the power of God

whereby a sinful species is propagated, whereby a sinful father begets a sinful son, then God is the author of sin ; that sinfulness is chargeable upon him ;" here we divide ; I cannot allow the consequence : because the same argument would make God chargeable with all the *sinful actions* of men. For it is the power of God whereby the murderer lifts up his arm, whereby the adulterer perpetrates his wickedness ; full as much as it is his power, whereby an acorn produces an oak, or a father a son. But does it follow, that God is chargeable with the sin ? You know it does not follow. The power of God, vulgarly termed *nature*, acts from age to age, under its fixed rules. Yet he who this moment supplies the power, by which a *sinful action* is committed, is not chargeable with the *sinfulness* of that action. In like manner, it is the power of God which from age to age continues the human species ; yet he who this moment supplies the power whereby a *sinful nature* is propagated, (according to the fixed rules established in the lower world,) is not chargeable with the *sinfulness* of that nature. This distinction you must allow, as was observed before, or charge God with all the sin committed under heaven. And this general answer may suffice any sincere and modest inquirer, without entangling himself in those minute particulars, which are beyond the reach of human understanding.

" But does not God create the nature of every man that comes into the world ?" He does not, in the proper sense of the word *create*. The Scripture plainly affirms the contrary. 'On the seventh day he rested from all his work which God created and made.' Gen. ii. 2. 'The works which God created were finished from the foundation of the world.' Heb. iv. 3. 10. And as soon as they were finished, 'God ceased from his work,' namely from his work of *creating*. He therefore now, (not *creates*, but) produces the body of every man, in the same manner as he produces the oak ; only by supplying the power whereby one creature begets another, according to what we term the *Laws of Nature*. In a higher sense he is the Creator of all souls. But *how* or *when*, he does or did create them, I cannot tell. Neither can I give any account, *how* or *when* he unites them to the body. Likewise *how* we are *conceived* in sin, I know not : but I know, *that* we are so conceived. God hath said it. And I know he will be 'justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged.'

It is certain, that God is the maker of every man. But it is neither certain nor true, that he "makes every man in the womb, both soul and body, as *immediately* as he made Adam :" and that therefore "every man comes out of the hands of God, as properly as Adam did." (p. 140.) To interpret any scriptures as affirming this, is to make them flatly contradict other scriptures. God made Adam by *immediate* creation : he does not *so make* every man, or any man beside him. Adam came *directly* out of the hands of God, without the *intervention* of any creature. Does every man thus come out of the hands of God ? Do no creatures now intervene ?

" But if God produces the nature of every man in the womb, he

must produce it with all the qualities which belong to that nature, as it is *then* and *so* produced." So, if God produces the *action* of every man in the world, he must produce it with all the qualities which belong to that action, as it is *then* and *so* produced. For it is impossible God should produce our nature, and not produce the qualities it has when produced." For it is impossible God should produce an *action*, and yet not produce the *qualities* it has when produced." "No substance can be made without some qualities. And it must necessarily, as soon as it is made, have those qualities which the Maker gives it, and no other." No *action* can be produced, without some qualities." And it must necessarily, as soon as it is produced, have those qualities which the producer gives it, and no other. You see what this argument would prove, if it proved any thing at all.

We will trace it a little farther: "If God produces the nature of every man in the womb, with all its qualities, then whatever those qualities are, they are the *will* and the *work* of God." So: if God produces the *action* of every man in the world, with all its *qualities*, then whatever those qualities are, they are the *will* and the *work* of God. Surely, no. God does, (in the sense above explained, produce the *action* which is *sinful*. And yet, (whether I can account for it or not, the *sinfulness* of it is not his *will* or *work*. He does also produce the *nature* which is *sinful*, (he supplies the power by which it is produced,) and yet, (whether I can account for this or not) the *sinfulness* of it is not his *will* or *work*. I am as sure of this, as I am that there is a God: and yet impenetrable darkness rests on the subject. Yet I am conscious my understanding can no more fathom this deep, than reconcile man's free-will with the fore-knowledge of God.

"Consequently those qualities cannot be *sinful*." This consequence cannot hold in one case, unless it holds in both. But if it does, there can be no sin in the universe.

However, you go on. "It is highly dishonourable to God, to suppose he is displeased at us, for what he himself has infused into our nature." (p. 142.) It is not allowed that he has "infused sin into our *nature*;" no more than that he infuses sin into our *actions*; though it is *his power* which produces both our actions and nature.

I am aware of the distinction, that man's *free-will* is concerned in the one case, but not the other: and that on this account, God cannot be charged with the *sinfulness* of human actions. But this does by no means remove the difficulty. For, 1. Does not God know what the murderer or adulterer is about to do? What use he will make of that *power to act*, which he cannot have but from God? 2. Does he not at the instant supply him with that power whereby the *sinful action* is done? God therefore *produces the action* which is *sinful*. It is his *work*, and his *will*, (for he works nothing but what he wills.) And yet the *sinfulness* of the action is neither his *work* nor *will*.

"But can those passions or propensities be *sinful*, which are neither caused nor consented to by me?" I answer, spite, envy, and those other passions and tempers which are manifestly discerni-

ble even in little children, are certainly *not virtuous*, not morally good, whether you term them *sinful* or *not*. And it is as certain, these exist before they are consented to, much less caused by those that feel them. “But sin, if it is unavoidable is no sin.” (p. 143.) Whether you term it *sin* or *not*, it is contrary to the nature of God, and a transgression of his holy and good law.

“But a natural-moral evil is a contradiction: for if it be natural, it cannot be moral.” That tempers contrary to the nature and the law of God are *natural*, is a point of daily experience. But if you do not choose to call these *morally evil*, call them what you please. All I aver is, that such tempers do exist in us antecedent to our choice.

“But if the actual sins of men proceed from a corrupt nature, they are unavoidable, and consequently no sins at all.” (p. 144.) *Actual sins* may proceed from a corrupt nature, and yet not be *unavoidable*. But if actions contrary to the nature of God were unavoidable, it would not follow, that they were innocent.

To the question, “How comes it to pass, that our passions and appetites are now so irregular and strong, that not one person has resisted them so as to keep himself pure and innocent?” You answer by another question, “How came Adam not to keep himself pure and innocent?” (p. 145.) There is no parity between the one case and the other. I can account for any one man’s committing sin, supposing him to be naturally upright, as easily as for Adam’s committing it. Any one person, as well as Adam, though naturally inclined to neither, might choose either good or evil. And on this supposition he would be as likely to choose one as the other. But the case is extremely different, if you place Adam on one side, and all mankind on the other. It is true, “the nature of sin is not altered by its being general.” But the case is very widely altered. On this or that man it may “come, just as it came upon Adam, by his own choice and compliance with temptation.” But how comes it, that all men under the sun, should *choose* evil rather than good? How came all the children of Adam from the beginning of the world till now, to comply with temptation? How is it that in all ages, the scale has turned the wrong way, with regard to every man born into the world? Can you see no difficulty in this? And can you find any way to solve that difficulty, but to say with the Psalmist, we were ‘shapen in iniquity, and in sin did our mothers conceive us?’



SECT VIII.

Of Original Righteousness.

“ORIGINAL Righteousness is said to be, that moral rectitude in which Adam was created. His reason was clear, and sense, appetite, and passion, were subject to it. Judgment was uncor-

rupted, and his will had a constant propensity to holiness. He had a supreme love to his Creator, a fear of offending him, and a readiness to do his will. When Adam sinned, he lost his moral rectitude, this image of God in which he was created : in consequence of which all his posterity come into the world destitute of that image.” (p. 147—149.)

In order to remove this mistake, you reconsider some of the texts on which it is grounded. ‘Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds ; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him.’ (Col. iii. 9, 10.) ‘That ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.’ (Eph. iv. 22—24.)

On this you affirm, “The old and new man here do not signify a course of life. .But the old man signifies the Heathen, the new man, the Christian profession.” (p. 150, 151.)

This you prove, 1. From Eph. ii. 15, ‘Christ abolished the enmity, to make (or create) in himself of twain one new man.’ Does this only mean *one new profession*? It evidently means, *one church*, both of *Jews and Gentiles*.

You prove it, 2. From Col. iii. 8—12, where “the apostle tells the Colossian Christians, that now they were obliged to put off anger, and to put on bowels of mercies ; to admit the Christian spirit into their hearts, and to practise Christian duties ; for this reason, because they ‘had put off the old man, and had put on the new.’ This shows the new man was something they might have put on, and yet be defective in personal, internal holiness.” True : defective so far, as still to want more : more ‘bowels of mercies, meekness, long suffering.’ But this does not show, that the *new man* does not mean, the principle both of internal and external holiness. The consciousness of having received this, is a strong motive both to depart from evil, and to labour after a continual increase of every holy and heavenly temper. Therefore here likewise, ‘the putting off the old and the putting on the new man,’ does not mean an *outward profession*, but a real, inward change : a renewal of soul ‘in righteousness and true holiness.’

You prove it, 3, from Eph. iv. 22, 24. Here you say, “He considers ‘the putting off the old, and putting on the new man,’ as a duty. They had done it by profession, and therefore were obliged to do it effectually.” They had done it effectually. So the whole tenor of the apostle’s words implies, ‘Ye have not so learned Christ : if so be (rather, *seeing that*) ye have been taught by him,—That ye put off the old man :—And be renewed in the spirit of your mind ; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.’ (Eph. iv. 20, 24.) The apostle here manifestly speaks not of a lesson they *had not learned*, but of one which God had *taught* them already : and thence exhorts them to

walk worthy of the blessing they had received, to be ‘holy in all manner of conversation.’

But, 4. “The putting on the new man is one thing, and the creating him is another. He must first be created, and then put on.” (p. 152.) No. He is *created* and *put on* at the same time : the former word more directly referring to God who creates, the latter to man who is created. “But God, you say, created the new man, when he erected the gospel-dispensation : as appears from Eph. ii. 15. 19—22.” I answer, 1. If those latter verses are explanatory of that expression, ‘one new man’ in the 15th, then it does not mean, one outward profession, but the one church of living believers in Christ : 2. The expression in the 15th verse, is not the same with that we are now considering. Neither is the meaning of that and this expression the same : one new man means one church and nothing else : the new man means quite another thing ; the work of God in every individual believer.

You say, 5. “The old man and the new, and the new man’s being renewed and created, and the renewing of the Ephesians, all refer not to any corruption of nature, but to their late wicked life.” (p. 153.) What ! Does their being renewed in the spirit of their mind, refer only to their wicked life ? If you had not affirmed this, I should really wonder at your affirming quickly after, “In all other places of Scripture, except 2 Cor. iv. 16, renewing relates only to a vicious course of life :” (p. 154,) seeing you immediately confute yourself, by both the following citations, ‘Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewal of your mind :’ (Rom. xii. 2,) unless the mind be only another expression for “a vicious course of life.” ‘We ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures ; living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another.’ Do these words imply nothing but “a vicious course of life ?” No inward corruption at all ? ‘But after that the loving kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared—He saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost.—From what ? From a vicious course of life only ? Nay, but from foolishness of heart also, from error, from malice, hatred, envy, evil desire ; all which are inward corruptions.

You add, “From all this we may gather, that God’s creating the new man after his own image in righteousness and true holiness, means his erecting the Christian church with a view to promote righteousness and holiness among men. ‘For we are God’s workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.’” (p. 155.) Surely you do not cite this verse also to prove, that the renewing of our mind implies no inward change ? It must be something more than an outward profession, or the reforming a vicious course of life, by reason of which we are said to be God’s workmanship, created anew in Christ Jesus.

These texts therefore do manifestly refer to personal, internal holiness, and clearly prove, that this is the chief part of that image of God in which man was originally created.

The other text which you reconsider is Eccles. vii. 29, ‘God hath made man upright ; but they have sought out many inventions.’ ‘But this, you say, does not mean, that God made man righteous ; but that he made him right, as having those powers, means, and encouragements, by a due use of which he may become righteous.’ In order to prove that this is the true meaning of the words, you affirm, 1. ‘That man is here not to be understood of Adam, but of all mankind.’ This cannot be granted without full proof. You affirm, 2. ‘This appears from the latter part of the sentence : ‘*They* sought out many inventions.’’ Adam and Eve did so, in and after their fall. This therefore proves nothing. You affirm, 3. The word *jashar* (which we translate *upright*) ‘does not always imply uprightness or righteousness.’ But this is its proper meaning, as will appear to any who seriously considers the following texts, 1. Deut. xii. 25, ‘When thou shalt do that which is *right* in the sight of the Lord.’ It is taken in the very same sense ver. 28, chap. xiii. 18, and xxi. 9. In all these texts it undeniably implies *morally good* or *righteous*. 2. Deut. xxxii. 4, ‘A God of truth and without iniquity ; just and *right* is he.’ Psalm xxv. 8, ‘Good and *upright* is the Lord.’ 3. Psalm xxxiii. 4, ‘The word of the Lord is *right*.’ Hos. xiv. 9, ‘The ways of the Lord are *right*.’ 4. Psalm xxxii. 11, ‘Be glad and rejoice, ye *righteous*.’ Psalm xxxiii. 1, ‘Rejoice in the Lord, O ye *righteous*.’ In the very same sense it occurs in numberless places. As the word is therefore properly applied to God himself, to his word, his providences, and his people : in all which cases it must necessarily mean *righteous*, we cannot lightly depart from this its proper signification.

But you think, there is a necessity of departing from it here : because, ‘to say, God created Adam righteous, is to affirm a contradiction, or what is inconsistent with the very nature of righteousness. For a righteousness wrought in him without his knowledge or consent, would have been no righteousness at all.’ (p. 161.) You may call it by any name you like better. But we must use the old name still : as being persuaded, that the love of God, governing the senses, appetites, and passions, however or whenever it is wrought in the soul, is true, essential righteousness.

Nay, ‘Righteousness is right action.’ Indeed it is not. Here, (as we said before) is your fundamental mistake. It is a *right state of mind*, which differs from *right action*, as the cause does from the effect. *Righteousness* is properly and directly, a *right temper* or *disposition of mind*, or a complex of all right tempers.

For want of observing this, you say, ‘Adam could not act before he was created. Therefore he must exist, and use his intellectual powers, before he could be righteous.’ ‘But according to this reasoning, as Dr. Jennings observes, Christ could not be righteous at his birth.’ You answer, ‘He existed before he was made flesh.’ I reply, he did, as God. But the man Christ Jesus did not. Neither therefore did he *use his intellectual powers*. According to your reasoning then, the Man Christ Jesus *could not be righteous at his birth*.

The Doctor adds, ‘Nay, according to this reasoning, God could

not be righteous from eternity; because he must exist, before he was righteous." You answer, "My reasoning would hold even with respect to God, were it true that he ever did begin to exist." But neither the existence nor the holiness of God was prior to each other." Nay, but if his existence was not prior to his holiness, if he did not exist *before* he was holy, your assertion, that every being must *exist* before it is *righteous*, is not true.

Besides, (to pursue your reasoning a little farther,) if "God did always exist," yet unless you can prove, that he always *acted*, it will not clear your argument. For let him exist millions of ages, he could not be *righteous* (according to your maxim) before he *acted right*.

One word more on this article.. You say, "My reasoning would hold good, even with respect to God, were it true, that he ever did begin to exist." Then I ask concerning the Son of God, Did he ever begin to exist? If he did not, he is the one, eternal God: (for there cannot be two Eternals) if he did, and your reasoning hold good, when he began to exist, he was not righteous.

"But St. John saith, 'He that doeth righteousness is righteous.' Yes, it appears he is, by his *doing* or practising *righteousness*. "But where doth the Scripture speak one word of a righteousness infused into us?" Where it speaks of the *love of God* (the essence of righteousness) *shed abroad in our hearts*.

And cannot God, by his almighty power, infuse any good tempers into us? You answer, "No. No being whatever can do for us, that which cannot be at all, if it be not our own choice, and the effect of our own industry and exercise. But all good tempers are the effect of our own industry and exercise. Otherwise they cannot be at all."

Nay then, it is certain, they *cannot be at all*. For neither lowliness, meekness, long-suffering, nor any other good temper, can ever be the effect of *my own industry and exercise*. But I verily believe they may be the effect of God's Spirit working in me whatsoever pleaseth him. See Isa. xxvi. 12.

You add, "The thing cannot exist, unless we choose, because our choosing to do what is right, is the very thing which is to exist." No: the thing which is to exist is, a *right state of mind*. And it is certain God can give this to any creature, at the very first moment of its existence. Nay, it may be questioned, whether God can create an intelligent being in any other state?

"But a habit is gained by repeated acts. Therefore habits of righteousness could not be created in man." Mere playing upon words! He *could be*, he *was* created full of love. Now, whether you call this a *habit* or not, it is the sum of all righteousness.

"But this love is either under the government of my will, or it is not." It is. The love of God which Adam enjoyed, was under the government of his will. "But if so, it could be righteous only so far as applied to right action in heart and life." (p. 165.) Stop here. The love of God is *righteousness*, the moment it exists in any soul. And it must exist before it can be applied to action. Accordingly

it was righteousness in Adam the moment he was created. And yet he had a power either to follow the dictates of that *love*, (in which case his righteousness would have endured for ever,) or to act contrary thereto : but *love* was *righteousness* still ; though it was not irresistible.

“ I might add, Adam’s inclination to sin (for he could not sin without a sinful inclination) must be so strong as to overcome his (supposed) inbred propensity to holiness : and so malignant, as to expel that principle at once, and totally. Consequently, the supposed original righteousness, was consistent with a sinful propensity, vastly stronger and more malignant than ever was or can be in any of his posterity: who cannot sin against such resistance, or with such dreadful consequences: Thus original righteousness in Adam proves far worse than original sin in his posterity.” (p. 166.)

I have set down your argument at large, that it may appear in its full strength. Now let us view it more closely. 1. “ Adam could not sin without a sinful inclination.” The sentence is ambiguous. Either it may mean, “ Adam could not *choose ill*, without some *sinful temper* preceding ;” and in this sense it is false : or he could not commit *outward sin*, without first *inclining*, that is, *choosing* so to do. 2. “ This his sinful inclination (or temper) was so strong as to overcome his inbred propensity to holiness.” It was not any *sinful inclination* (in this sense) which overcame his propensity to holiness : but strong temptation from without : how strong we know not : and the circumstances of it, we know not. 3. “ That his sinful inclination was so malignant, as to expel that principle at once and totally.” Not by any *sinful inclination*, but by yielding to temptation, he did lose the love and image of God. But that this was *totally*, and *at once*, we have no authority to affirm. 4. “ Consequently original righteousness in Adam was consistent with a sinful propensity, vastly stronger and more malignant, than ever was or can be in any of his posterity.” It was consistent with no *sinful propensity* at all, but barely with a *power* of yielding to temptation. It declined in the same proportion, and by the same degrees, as he did actually yield to this. And when he had yielded entirely and eaten the fruit, *original righteousness* was no more. Therefore the 5th proposition, “ Thus original righteousness proves to be far worse than original sin,” is flourish. What a figure does this fair argument make, now it is turned inside out!

From all this it may appear, that the doctrine of *Original Righteousness*, (as well as that of *Original Sin*,) hath a firm foundation in Scripture, as well as in the attributes of a wise, holy, and gracious God.

As you do not offer any new argument in your conclusion, I need not spend any time upon it.

You subjoin Remarks on Dr. Watts’s additions to his book. (p. 186.) Some of these deserve a serious consideration.

1. “ Either the new-created man loved God supremely, or not. If he did not, he was not innocent : since the very law and light of

nature require such a love to God. If he did, he stood disposed for every act of obedience. And this is true holiness of heart."

You answer (in many words) "The new-created man did not love God supremely. For before he could love God, the powers of his mind must have been quite finished, and actually exercised." And doubtless the very moment he was created, they were quite *finished* and *actually exercised* too. For man was not *gradually formed* by God, as a statue is by a human artificer: but 'he spake the word, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created.' And as light and heat were not subsequent to the creation of the sun, but began to exist with it, so that the moment it existed it shone, so spiritual light and heat, knowledge and love, were not subsequent to the creation of man: but they began to exist together with him. The moment he existed, he knew and loved.

2. "If the new-made creature had not a propensity to love and obey God, but was in a state of mere indifference to good or evil, then his being put into such an union with flesh and blood, among a thousand temptations, would have been an over-balance on the side of vice. But our reason can never suppose, that God the wise, just, and good, would have placed a new-made creature in such a situation."

This argument cannot be answered, unless it can be showed, either, 1. That in such a situation, there would not have been an over-balance on the side of vice; or, 2. That to place a new-made creature in a situation where there was such an over-balance, was consistent with the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God.

But instead of showing, or even attempting to show this, you feebly say, "I do not think the reason of man by any means sufficient to direct God, in what state to make moral agents." (p. 187, 188.) (O that you had always thought so! How much vain, yea, mischievous reasoning, had then been spared!) "But however Adam's propensities and temptations were balanced, he had freedom to choose evil as well as good." He had. But this is no answer to the argument, which like the former, remains in its full force. How could a wise, just, and good God, place his creature in such a state as that the scale of evil should preponderate! Although it be allowed he is *in a measure* free still: the other scale does not "fly up and kick the beam."

3. "Notwithstanding all the cavils which have been raised, yet if these two texts (Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10) are considered, their obvious meaning will strike an honest and unbiassed reader. The new man, or the principle of true religion in the heart, is created by God after his moral image, in that righteousness and true holiness wherein man was at first created." (p. 189.)

You answer, "I have endeavoured to prove the contrary, and he does not offer to point out any one mistake in my interpretations." I have pointed out more than one.

4. "If these are the qualifications with which such a new-made creature should be endued, and these the circumstances, wherein from

the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God, we should expect him to be situated : then by a careful survey of what man is now, compared with what he should be, we may easily determine, whether man is at present such a creature, as the great and blessed God made him at first."

You answer, (in abundance of words, the sum of which is this,) "Our circumstances are, on the whole, far better than Adam's were. For he was under that severe law, Transgress and die." (p. 190.) He was so : but this does not prove the point still, balancing this single disadvantage, (if such it was ; for even that may be disputed,) with the numerous advantages he was possessed of, with the holiness and happiness which he enjoyed, and might have enjoyed for ever, it does by no means appear, that the present circumstances of mankind in general are better than Adam's were.

5. "God did not give Noah dominion over the brute creatures, in so ample a manner as he did to Adam. Fear indeed fell on the brutes : but this does not sufficiently preserve man from their outrage. In the innocent state no man would have been poisoned or torn by serpents or lions as now."

You answer, "The second grant runs, 'The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the field, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moves on the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea : into your hands they are delivered. Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you : even as the green herb I have given you all things.' Now this grant is more extensive than the first." (p. 192.) It is as to *food* ; but not as to *dominion*. The liberty of eating an animal does not necessarily imply any dominion over it at all. "But the fear and dread of every beast are the effects of dominion in man, and the subjection in brutes." Nay, neither does *fear* necessarily imply *dominion*. I may *fear* what has not dominion over me, and what I am not *subject* to. And those animals may *fear* me, over which nevertheless I have not dominion, neither are they *subject* to me. I *fear* every viper, yea, every poisonous spider ; and they *fear* me : yet neither has dominion over the other. *Fear* therefore and *dread* may be in a high degree : and yet no *dominion* at all. But they are "*all delivered into our hands*." Yes, for *meat* ; as the very next words explain that expression. Whatever therefore it may "import in other scriptures," the meaning of it here is plain and certain.

6. "Would God have exposed the pure and innocent works of his hands, to such unavoidable perils and miseries, as arise from bears, tigers, serpents, precipices, volcanoes, &c.?"

You answer, "He did expose innocent Adam to a peril and misery greater than all these put together, even to a tempting Devil." (p. 191, 192.) I reply, 1. This did not imply any *unavoidable misery* at all : 2. It implied no more peril than God saw was needful, as a test of his obedience. Therefore this has no parallel case. So this argument also stands unanswered.

7. "It has been said indeed, If Adam fell into Sin though he was

innocent, then among a million of creatures every one might sin, though he was as innocent as Adam. I answer, there is a possibility of the event: but the improbability of it is as a million to one. I prove it thus. If a million of creatures were made, in an equal probability to stand or fall; and if all the numbers from one to one million inclusively were set in a rank, it is plainly a million to one, that just any single proposed number of this multitude should fall. Now the total sum is one of these numbers, that is, the last of them. Consequently it is a million to one against the supposition, that the whole number of men should fall. And this argument will grow still ten thousand times stronger, if we suppose ten thousand millions to have lived since the creation."

Your argument stood thus. : "If we cannot infer from Adam's transgression, that his nature was originally corrupt, neither can we infer from the transgressions of all mankind, that their nature is originally corrupt." - It is answered, "If a million creatures were made in an equal probability to stand or fall, it is a million to one they should not all fall." You reply, "This is no answer to my argument." Surely it is; and a direct answer. That *one man* sinned, does not prove he had a corrupt nature. Why? Because (supposing him free to choose good or evil) it was as probable he should sin as not, there being no odds on one side or the other. But that all men should sin does prove they have a corrupt nature: because it is not as probable, that *all men* should sin, as that *one man* should: the odds against it being as a million or rather ten thousand millions to one. Either therefore we must allow, that mankind are more inclined to evil than to good, or we must maintain a supposition so highly improbable, as comes very near a flat impossibility.

And thus much you yourself cannot but allow: "The reasoning may hold good, where all circumstances agree, to make the probability equal with regard to every individual in this supposed million." And how can the *probability* be other than equal, if every individual be as wise and as good as Adam? But be it equal or not, you say, "The case is not to be estimated by the laws of equal probability, but of infection. For when sin is once entered into a body of men, it goes on, not according to the laws of chance," (is this precisely the same with *equal probability*?) "but the laws, as I may say, of infection." But how came sin to *enter into a body of men*? That is the very question. Supposing first a *body of sinners*, sin "may assume the nature of a contagion." But the difficulty lies against supposing any *body of sinners* at all. You say indeed, "One sinner produces another, as the serpent drew in Eve! The first sin and sinner being like a 'little leaven which leavens the whole lump.'" All this I can understand, supposing our nature is inclined to evil. But if not, why does not one good man produce another, as naturally as one sinner produces another? And why does not righteousness spread as fast and as wide among mankind as wickedness? Why does not this 'leaven leaven the whole lump,' as frequently, as readily, and as thoroughly, as the other? These *laws of infection* (so

called) will therefore stand you in no stead. For, (to bring the matter still more to a point,) suppose Adam and Eve newly *infected* by sin: they had then none to *infect*, having no child. Afterward they repented and found mercy. Then Cain was born: now surely neither Adam nor Eve would infect him! Having suffered so severely for their own sin: which therefore they must needs guard him against. How then came he to be a sinner? "Oh, by his own choice, as Seth was righteous." Well: afterwards both wicked Cain and good Seth begat sons and daughters. Now was it not just as probable, one should *infect* his children with goodness, as the other with wickedness? How came then Cain to transmit vice any more than Seth to transmit virtue? If you say, "Seth did transmit virtue: his posterity was virtuous till they mixed with the vicious offspring of Cain." I answer, 1. How does that appear? How do you prove, that all the posterity of Seth was virtuous? But, 2. If they were, why did not this mixture amend the vicious, rather than corrupt the virtuous? If our nature is equally inclined to virtue and vice, vice is no more *contagious* than virtue. How then came it totally to prevail over virtue, so that 'all flesh had corrupted themselves before the Lord?' *Contagion* and *infection* are nothing to the purpose; seeing they might propagate good as well as evil.

Let us go one step farther. Eight persons only were saved from the general deluge. We have reason to believe, that four, at least, of these, were persons truly virtuous. How then came vice to have a majority again, among the new inhabitants of the earth? Had the nature of man been inclined to neither, virtue must certainly have had as many votaries as vice. Nay, suppose man a reasonable creature, and supposing virtue to be agreeable to the highest reason, according to all the rules of probability, the majority of mankind must in every age have been on the side of virtue.

8. "Some have reckoned up a large catalogue of the instances of divine goodness, and would make this as evident a proof that mankind stands in the favour of God, as all the other instances are, of a universal degeneracy of man, and the anger of God against them. But it is easy to reply, The goodness of God may incline him to bestow a thousand bounties upon criminals. But his justice and goodness will not suffer him to inflict misery in such an universal manner, where there has been no sin to deserve it either in parents or children."

You answer, "There is more than enough sin among mankind, to deserve all the sufferings God inflicts upon them. And the Scriptures represent those sufferings as disciplinary, for correction and reformation." What, *all* the sufferings of *all* mankind? This can in nowise be allowed. Where do the Scriptures say, that all sufferings, those of infants in particular, are purely *disciplinary*, and intended only "for correction and reformation?" Neither can this be reconciled to matter of fact. How did the sufferings of Grecian or Roman infants, tend to their correction or reformation? Neither

do they tend to the correction and reformation of their parents or of any other persons under heaven. And even as to adults: if universal suffering is a proof of universal sin; and universal sin could not take place, unless men were naturally prone to evil. Then the present sufferings of mankind are a clear and strong evidence that their nature is prone to evil.

9. "Notwithstanding all God's provision for the good of man, still the Scripture represents men, while they are in their fallen state, as destitute of God's favour, and without hope."

You answer, "How can men be destitute of God's favour, when he has vouchsafed them a Redeemer?" (p. 207.) By *destitute of God's favour*, we mean, *children of wrath*, objects of God's displeasure. And because they were so, the Redeemer was given, to *reconcile* them to God by his own blood. But notwithstanding this, *while we and they were in our fallen state, we were all objects of God's displeasure.*

"But how can they be without hope, when he hath given them the hope of eternal life?" All men who are not born again, born of God, are *without hope* at this day. God indeed hath *given*, but they have *not accepted* 'the hope of eternal life.' Hence the bulk of mankind are still as void of *this hope* as are the beasts that perish. And so (the Scripture declares) are all men *by nature*, whatever difference grace may make. 'By nature all are children of wrath, without hope, without God in the world.'

10. "Doth that man write the sincere sense of his own mind and conscience, who charges the expression, *Adam was on trial for us all*, with this inference, "That we are none of us in a state of trial now, but Adam alone was upon trial for us all?" We have owned and granted, that men are now in a state of trial: but this is upon the foot of a new covenant."

You answer, "What can be more evident than that according to this scheme Adam alone was to be upon trial for us all, and that none of Adam's posterity are upon personal trial?" (p. 209.) Do you not see the ambiguity in the word *alone*? Or do you see and dissemble it? Dr. Watts supposes, that Adam alone, that is, *This single person* was on trial for all men. Does it follow from hence, that Adam *alone*, that is, *no other person*, was ever in a state of trial? Again: if *no person but Adam was upon trial for all men*, will it follow, "*no person but Adam was upon trial at all?*" It is really hard to think, that you here "speak the sincere sense of your own mind and conscience."

You go on, "He supposes all mankind are still under the original covenant with Adam, according to which he *alone* was upon trial for us all, and none of his posterity are upon personal trial." He does not suppose any man to be so under that covenant, as to supersede his being upon personal trial. Yourself add, "I knew he owned, we are upon personal trial, and that all mankind are now under the covenant of grace. But how can either of these consist with the scheme?" Both of them consist with it perfectly well. 1. Adam

alone or *single* was, in some sense, on trial for all mankind, according to the tenor of the old covenant, “Do this and live.” 2. Adam fell, and hereby the sentence of death came on him and all his posterity.

3. The new covenant was given, whereby all mankind were put into a state of personal trial. Yet still, 4. Death, the penalty of the old covenant, came (more or less) on all mankind. Now all this is well consistent with itself, as well as with the tenor of Scripture.

11. “Mankind is represented as one collective body in several verses of the 5th chapter to the Romans.”

You answer, “St. Paul always distinguishes between Adam, and all men, his posterity, and does not consider Adam with all men, as one creature.” (p. 211.) What then? This does not prove, that he does not represent mankind (Adam’s posterity, *as one collective body*.)

12. “All that is contained in the *blessing* given to Noah is consistent with the curse which came on all men by the first sin. But that curse is not consistent with the *original blessing* which was given to Adam.”

You answer, “The blessing given to Noah, was the very same which was given to Adam.” (p. 212.) This is palpably false. The blessing which was given to Adam included, 1. Freedom from pain and death. 2. Dominion over the whole brute creation. But that given to Noah did not include either. Yet you affirm, “It is renewed to Noah, without any manner of alteration, after pain and death were introduced into the world!” And do *pain* and *death* then make *no manner of alteration*?

13. “The dominion over the brutes given to Adam was not given to Noah.”

You answer, “Our killing and feeding upon them is the highest instance of dominion over them.” (p. 213.) It is no instance of it at all. I may shoot a bear and then eat him: yet I have no dominion unless it be over his carcass.

PART IV

Extracts from Dr. Watts and Mr. Hebdon.

I have now considered what is material in your *Doctrine of Original Sin*, with the *Supplement and Reply to Dr. Watts*. And this I purposely did before I read the doctor’s book. But how was I surprised on reading it, to observe the manner wherein you have treated it, of which I could not be a judge before! The frame which he had so beautifully and strongly connected, you have disjointed and broken in pieces, and given us nothing but mangled fragments of it, from which it is impossible to form any judgment of the whole. In order, therefore, to do justice to that great and good man, as well as

to his argument, I subjoin an Extract of so much of that work as directly affects the main question.

I the rather subjoin this and the following extracts, for these two reasons, 1. Because what has gone before being purely argumentative, is dry and less profitable to the generality of readers. 2. Because they contain one, uniform, connected scheme of the great doctrine which I have been hitherto defending: and which, after the objections have been removed out of the way, may be more clearly understood and firmly embraced.

INTRODUCTION.

“ Man is a creature made up of an animal body and a rational mind, so united as to act in a mutual correspondence according to certain laws appointed by his Creator. Now suppose the blessed God, who is perfect in wisdom and power, in justice and goodness, were to form such a new creature, with what qualifications may we conceive such a creature would be endowed, by a being of such Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom?

“ I We cannot but conceive, he must have a perfection of natural powers, both of body and spirit, as united together, suited to his present circumstances. (p. 2.)

“ Not that we need conceive, man would be made so perfect a being as God could make him. For the wisdom of God plainly designed to display itself in the different ranks and orders of his creation. Nor is it reasonable to suppose, man would be made at first with such sublime perfections, as he himself might afterwards arrive at, by a wise improvement of his powers. But still the creature which was designed to bear the nearest likeness of his Maker in this lower world, must have powers perfectly sufficient for his present well-being, and acting in that station wherein God had placed him. All his senses must be clear and strong, his limbs vigorous and active, his body healthy in all the inward and outward parts of it, and every natural power in its proper order. For God would surely form such a creature, in a state of perfect ease, without any original malady of nature, to give him pain or sorrow. (p. 3.) Nor could there be any tendency in his body to pain or disease while he remained without sin. (p. 4.)

“ And as the powers of his body must be thus perfect, so the faculties of his soul must have their perfection too.

“ His *Understanding* must have that knowledge both of God and his creatures, which was needful for his happiness. Not that he was formed with all knowledge in arts and sciences, but with such as was requisite to his peace and welfare. His reason must be clear, his judgment uncorrupted, and his conscience upright and sensible.

“ This leads me to speak of his *moral perfection*. (p. 5.) A rational creature thus made, must not only be innocent, as a tree, but must

be formed holy. His will must have an inward bias to virtue: he must have an inclination to please that God who made him, a supreme love to his Creator, a zeal to serve him, and a tender fear of offending him.

“ For either the new created man loved God supremely, or not. If he did not he was not innocent, since the law of nature requires a supreme love to God. If he did he stood ready for every act of obedience: and this is *true holiness of heart*. And, indeed, without this, how could a God of holiness love the work of his own hands?

“ There must be also in this creature a regular subjection of the inferior powers to the superior. Sense, and appetite, and passion must be subject to reason. The mind must have a power to govern these lower faculties, that he might not offend against the law of his creation.

“ He must also have his heart inlaid with love to the creatures, especially those of his own species, if he should be placed among them: and with a principle of honesty and truth in dealing with them. And if many of these creatures were made at once, there would be no pride, malice, or envy, no falsehood, no brawls, or contentions among them, but all harmony and love. (p. 6.)

“ This universal righteousness, which is the *moral Image* of God, is far the noblest part of that image in which Moses represents man to have been originally created. The same writer assures us, that when God surveyed all his works, he pronounced them *very good!* Agreeably to what Solomon assures us that God ‘made man upright.’ p. 7.

“ It is true, the *natural image* of God in which man was created, consisted in his spiritual, intelligent, and immortal nature; and his *political image*, (if I may so speak,) in his being Lord of this lower creation. But the chief, the moral part of his image, we learn from St. Paul to have been the rectitude of man’s nature: who in his epistle to the Ephesians, (iv. 24.) says, that the image of God in which man is to be renewed, and, consequently, in which he was made, consists ‘in righteousness and true holiness.’

“ II. From the justice and goodness of God we may infer, that though man was made *free*, with a power to choose either evil or good, that he might be put into a state of probation, yet he had a full sufficiency of power, to preserve himself in love and obedience to his Creator, and to guard himself against every temptation. (p. 8.)

“ III. It is highly probable, from the goodness of God, that such a creature would be *made immortal*. It is true the great God as sovereign Lord of his creatures, might take away all that he had given. But it is hard to suppose, that he ever would have destroyed an intelligent creature, who had continued to serve and please him. (p. 9.)

“ It is also probable, that he was endued with power to arrive at higher degrees of excellency and happiness, than those in which he was formed at first: and hereby he was greatly encouraged both to watch against every sin, and to use all zeal and diligence in improving the powers he had received.

“IV We may add, that the habitation in which a God of infinite goodness would place such an innocent and holy creature, would be furnished with all the necessaries and conveniences of life, and prepared for his delight as well as safety. And so Moses tells us, that the first created pair were placed in Eden, a garden of pleasure, and were made lords of all therein, of all the creatures, animal and vegetable, that were round about them: (p. 10.)

“Neither can we conceive that any thing destructive or hurtful could be found in this delightful habitation, but what man would have sufficient notice of, with sufficient power to oppose or avoid it.

“V And if this creature had power to propagate its kind, the child must be innocent and holy, and equally capable of persevering in virtue and happiness. (p. 11.)

“Now if we may judge from the wisdom, justice, and goodness of God, that these are the qualifications with which such a new-made creature would be endued, these the circumstances in which he would be situated, then by a careful survey of what mankind is now, we may easily judge whether man is now such a creature as the great and blessed God made him at first? And this is the subject of the ensuing inquiry.

QUESTION I.

“Is man in his present circumstances such a creature as he came out of the hands of God his Creator?” We may derive a full answer to this inquiry from the following considerations. (p. 12.)

“I. This earth, which was designed for the habitation of man, carries evident tokens of ruin and desolation, and does not seem to be ordained in its present form and circumstances, for the habitation of innocent beings; but is apparently fit for the dwelling-place of creatures who are degenerate and fallen from God.

“It is granted that the beauty and order of this lower world, even in its present constitution, and the wonderful texture, composition, and harmony of the several parts of it, both in air, earth, and sea, do still illustriously display the power, wisdom, and goodness of their Creator. (p. 13.) Yet it must be confessed also, that there are glaring proofs, of the terrors of his justice, and the execution of his vengeance.

“Is not the present shape of our earth, in its divisions of seas and shores, rude and irregular, abrupt and horrid? Survey a map of the world, and say, Does the form of it strike our eyes with any natural beauty and harmony? Rather does it not strongly bear on our sight the idea of ruin and confusion? Travel over the countries of this globe, or visit several parts of this island. What various appearances of a ruined world! What vast broken mountains hang over the heads of travellers! What stupendous cliffs and promontories rise high and hideous to behold! What dreadful precipices, which make us giddy to look down, and are ready to betray us into destruction! What immense extents are there in many countries of vast and barren ground! What vast and almost impassable deserts! What broad

and faithless morasses, which are made at once both death and graves to unwary travellers ! What huge ruinous caverns, deep and wide, big enough to bury whole cities ! (p. 14.)

“ What resistless deluges of water, in a season of great rains, come rolling down the hills, bear all things before them, and spread spacious desolation ! What roaring and tremendous water-falls in several parts of the globe ! What burning mountains, in whose caverns are lakes of liquid fire, ready to burst upon the lower lands ! Or they are a mere shell of earth, covering prodigious cavities of smoke, and furnaces of flame : and seem to wait a divine command, to break inward and bury towns and provinces in fiery ruin. (p. 15.)

“ What active treasures of wind are pent up in the bowels of the earth, ready to break out into wide and surprising mischief ! What huge torrents of water rush and roar through the hollows of the globe we tread ! What dreadful sounds and threatening appearances from the region of meteors in the air ! What clouds charged with flame, ready to burst on the earth and discompose and terrify all nature !

“ When I survey such scenes as these, I cannot but say within myself, “ surely this earth, in these rude and broken appearances, this unsettled and dangerous state, was designed as a dwelling for some unhappy inhabitants, who did or would transgress the laws of their Maker, and merit desolation from his hand. And he hath here stored up his magazines of divine artillery against the day of punishment.” (p. 16.)

“ How often have the terrible occurrences of nature in the air, earth, and sea, and the calamitous incidents in several countries, given a strong confirmation of this sentiment !

“ What destructive storms have we and our fathers seen even in this temperate island of Great Britain ! What floods of water and violent explosions of fire do we read of in the histories of the world ! What shocking convulsions of the globe, stretching far and wide under the affrighted nations ! What huge disruptions of the caverns of the earth, with tremendous bellowings, which have filled its inhabitants with terror and astonishment, and made wide devastations ! Would a good and gracious being have originally so formed the inanimate parts of this lower world, as to produce such deadly concussions therein, and such desolating appearances, had he not designed it for the habitation of such creatures, as he foresaw would deserve these strokes of his indignation ? (p. 17.)

“ And thus both Moses and St. Peter suppose God to have laid up stores of ruin and destruction within the bowels of the earth, that he might break open his dreadful treasures of flood and fire at proper seasons, to drown and to burn the world, together with the sinful inhabitants thereof. (p. 18, 19.)

“ Now the great God, who appointed such prodigious quantities both of water and fire to be reserved in the bowels of the earth, and among the clouds of heaven, for such a foreseen day of general de-

struction, did also doubtless prepare the materials of all the lesser storms and hurricanes, earthquakes and floods, and convulsions of nature ; and treasured up for these purposes his magazines of wind, and flood, and fire in the earth. And is this an habitation prepared for the residence of pure and holy beings ? Is this such a peaceful place, as a kind Creator would have formed for innocent creatures ? It is absurd to imagine this of a God so wise, so righteous, and so merciful. (p. 20.)

“ 2. Let us take a survey of the vegetables which grow out of the earth, with the brute animals which are found on the surface of it, and we shall find more reasons to conclude that man, the chief inhabitant, is not such as he came first out of his Maker’s hand.

“ It must be granted here again, that the wisdom and goodness of the Creator are amazingly displayed, in the animal and the vegetable world, beyond the utmost reach of our thoughts or praises. But still we may have leave to inquire, whether if man had continued innocent, among the numerous herbs and flowers fitted for his support and delight, any plants or fruits of a malignant, mortal nature, would have grown out of the earth, without some plain mark or caution set upon them ? (p. 21.)

“ Can we suppose that among the roots, herbs, and trees, good for food, the great God would have suffered mischief, malady, and deadly poison, to spring up here and there, without any sufficient distinction, that man might know how to avoid them ? This is the case in our present world : disease, anguish, and death, have entered into the bowels and veins of multitudes, by an innocent and fatal mistake of these pernicious things, for proper food.

“ There was indeed *the Tree of Knowledge* in Paradise. But man was expressly cautioned against it. And certainly had he continued holy, no poisonous plant would have been suffered to grow on the earth, without either some natural mark set upon it, or some divine caution to avoid it. (p. 22.)

“ Proceed to the animal world. There are many creatures indeed, which serve the use or pleasure of man. But are there not many other sorts, which he is neither able to govern, nor to resist ? And by which all his race are exposed, whenever they meet them, to wounds, and anguish, and death ? (p. 23.)

“ If man had not sinned, would there have been in the world any such creatures as bears and tigers, wolves and lions, animated with such fierceness and rage, and armed with such destructive teeth and talons ? Would the innocent children of men have ever been formed to be the living prey of these devourers ? Were the life and limbs of holy creatures made to become heaps of agonizing carnage ? Or would their flesh and bones have been given up to be crushed and churned between the jaws of panthers and leopards, sharks and crocodiles ? Let brutes be content to prey on their fellow brutes, but let man be their lord and ruler.

“ If man were not fallen, would there have been so many tribes of the serpent-kind, armed with deadly venom ? Would such subl.

and active mischiefs have been made and sent to dwell in a world of innocents ? And would the race of all these murderers and destructive animals, have been propagated for six thousand years, in any province of God's dominion, had not its rational inhabitants been in rebellion against God ? (p. 24.)

“ What are the immense flights of locusts which darken the sky, and lay the fields desolate ? What are the armies of hornets or musquitos, that frequently make a pleasant land almost intolerable ? If they are found in the heats of Africa, and of the East and West Indies, one would think they should not infest the Polar regions, if the Creator had not designed them for a scourge to the nations on all sides of the globe.

“ What are the innumerable host of caterpillars but so many messengers of the anger of God against a sinful race ? And since we can neither resist nor subdue them, we may certainly infer, that we are not now such favourites of heaven, as God at first made us. (p. 25.)

“ The troublesome and pernicious tribes of animals, both of large and smaller size, which are fellow-commoners with us on this great globe, together with our impotence to prevent or escape their mischiefs, is a sufficient proof that we are not in the full favour and love of the God that made us, and that he has quartered his armies, his legions among us, as princes do in a rebellious province.

“ It is true all these are trials for man during his state of probation. But a state of probation for innocent man would not have included death ; much less a violent and bloody, or a lingering and painful death. Accordingly, our return to dust is mentioned by Moses as a curse of God for the sin of man. And when once life is forfeited by all mankind, then a painful death may properly become a part of the further trial of such creatures as are to rise again : and any pious sufferers may be rewarded by a happy resurrection. But a painful death could never be made a part of the trial of innocent creatures, who had never forfeited life, nor were ever legally subjected to death. (p. 26, 27.)

“ Upon the whole, therefore, such noxious and destructive plants and animals could not be made to vex and disturb, to poison and destroy, a race of innocent, intellectual beings.

“ 3. The manner of our entrance into life is another proof of universal sin. (p. 29.) Would the great and good God have appointed intellectual animals, had they been sinless, to be propagated in such a way as should necessarily give such exquisite pain and anguish to the mothers who bring them forth ? And if the contagion had not been universal, why should such acute pangs attend almost every female parent ? Are not the multiplied sorrows with which the daughters of Eve bring forth, an evident token that they are not in their original state of favour, with that God who created them and pronounced a blessing upon them in their propagation ?*

* The author has been censured here for not dropping a tear over the fair sex un-

“ Moses informs us, that God blessed the first pair, and bid them ‘be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it :’ and soon after tells us, that these *multiplied sorrows* in child-birth are a curse from an offended God. Surely the curse is not as old as the blessing ; but sin and sorrow came in together, and spread a wide curse over the birth of man, which before stood only under a divine benediction. Not that the blessing is now quite taken away, though the pains of child-bearing are added to it. And daily experience proves, this curse is not taken away by the blessing repeated to Noah.

“ 4. Let us consider in the next place, how the generality of mankind are preserved in life. Some few have their food without care or toil : but millions of human creatures, in all the nations of the earth, are constrained to support a wretched life by hard labour. What dreadful risks of life or limbs, do multitudes run, to purchase their necessary food ? What waste of the hours of sweet repose, what long, and slavish, and painful toils by day, do multitudes sustain in order to procure their daily nourishment ? It is by the sweat of their brows they obtain their bread : it is by a continual exhausting their spirits, that many of them are forced to relieve their own hunger, and to feed their helpless offspring.

“ If we survey the lower ranks of mankind, even in England, in a land of freedom and plenty, a climate temperate and fertile, which abounds with corn, and fruits, and rich variety of food : yet what a hard shift do ten thousand families make to support life ? Their whole time is devoured by bodily labour, and their souls almost eaten up with gnawing cares, to answer that question, What shall I eat, and what shall I drink ? Even in the poorest and coarsest manner ? But if we send our thoughts to the sultry regions of Africa, the frost and snows of Norway, the rocks and deserts of Lapland and northern Tartary, what a frightful thing is human life ? How is the rational nature lost in slavery, and brutality, and incessant toils, and hardships ? They are treated like brutes by their lords, and they live like dogs and asses, among labours and wants, hunger and weariness, blows and burthens without end. Did God appoint this for innocents ? (p. 30, 31.)

“ Is the momentary pleasure of eating and drinking a recompence for incessant labour ? Does it bear any proportion to the length of toil, pain, and hazard, wherewith the provisions of life are procured ? Moses thought not. When he speaks of man’s ‘eating bread in the sweat of his brow,’ he acknowledges this to be another of the curses of God for the sin of man. (p. 32.)

“ It is strange that any man should say, “ In this sentence of God, no curse is pronounced upon either Adam’s body, soul, or posterity : that the sorrow of child-bearing is not inflicted as a curse : that the labours of life were increased, but not as a curse : that death wa-

der their sorrows and acute pains. But he imagines, he has been dropping tears in every page, and that over every part of mankind.” Undoubtedly he has : and if so, how unjust, how cruel is that censure ?

not a curse." I would fain ask, what is a *curse*, if some natural evil pronounced and executed upon a person or thing, be not so ? Especially when it is pronounced on account of sin, and by God himself, as supreme Governor and Judge ? And even the curse on the ground falls properly on the person who tills it.

" It is granted, God can turn curses into blessings. Yet these evils were originally pronounced and inflicted as a *curse* or *punishment* of sin, as it is written, ' Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things.' And that death was designed as a *curse* on man for sin is evident ; for Christ suffered that *curse* for us.

5. " Consider the character of mankind in general with regard to religion and virtue, and it will be hard to believe they bear the image of their common father in knowledge and holiness. Some I grant, are renewed in his image : but the bulk of the world are of another stamp ; and sufficiently show, there is some fatal contagion spread through this province of God's dominion. So St. John tells us, that except the few who are *born of God*, ' the whole world lieth in wickedness.' p. 33.

" And can we think of that gross and stupid ignorance of God, which reigns through vast tracts of Asia, Africa, and America, and the thick darkness which buries all the Heathen countries, and reduces them almost to brutes : can we think of the abominable idolatries, the lewd and cruel rites of worship which have been spread through whole nations ; the impious and ridiculous superstitions which are now practised among the greatest part of the world ; and yet believe the blessed God would put such wretched polluted workmanship out of his pure hands ? (p. 34.)

" Can we survey the desperate impiety and profaneness, the swearing, and cursing, and wild blasphemy, that is practised, day and night among vast multitudes of those who profess to know the true God : can we behold that almost universal neglect of God, of his fear, his worship, and the obedience due to him, which is found even among them who are called Christians ; and yet imagine, that these bear that image of God, in which they were created ?

" Nor have men forgot God only, but they seem also to have abandoned their duties to their fellow-creatures also. Hence the perpetual practices of fraud and villany in the commerce of mankind, the innumerable instances of oppression and cruelty which run through the world ; the pride and violence of the great, the wrath, ambition, and tyranny of princes, and the endless iniquities and mischiefs that arise, from malice, envy, and revenge, in lower people. If we add to these the impure scenes of lust and intemperance, which defy the day and pollute the darkness : with the monstrous barbarities which are continually committed by the Heathen savages in Africa and America, (some of whom kill and roast their fellow-creatures, and eat up men as they eat bread,) and by the Christian savages in the *Inquisition* established in Asia, as well as in many parts of Europe : can we still imagine, that mankind abide in that state, wherein they came from the hands of *their Maker* ? (p. 35.)

“ That far the *greatest number of men are evil*, was the known sentiment of the wiser Heathens. (p. 37.) They saw and bewailed the undeniable fact, though they knew not how to account for it. οὐ πλεῖστος καλός. *Most men are wicked*, was a common observation among them. Even the poets could not but see this obvious truth. So Virgil brings in Anchises, telling his son, Few are happy in the other world :

Pauci læta arva tenemus.

And in this life, Horace remarks of men in general,

Nitimus in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata;

We are always desiring and pursuing forbidden things. Nay he says,

Vitiis nemo sine nascitur; No man is born without vices: and gives this character of young men in general.

Cereus in vitium flecti; monitoribus asper. Seneca says just the same,

Pejora juvenes facile præcepta audiunt:

Young men readily hearken to evil counsels; they are soft as wax to be moulded into vice, but rough and rugged to their best monitors.

“ Juvenal abounds with the same accounts of human nature;

Quæ tam festa dies, ut casset prodere furem?

Ad mores natura recurrit

Damnatos, fixa et mutari nescia.

Quisnam hominum est, quem tu contentum videris uno

Flagitio? Dociles imitandis

Turpibus et pravis omnes sumus.

.. 6. And not only they of riper age, but even those of tender years, discover the principles of iniquity and seeds of sin. What young ferments of spite and envy, what native wrath and rage, are found in the little hearts of infants, and sufficiently discovered by their hands, and eyes, and countenances, before they can speak or know good from evil! What additional crimes of lying and deceit, obstinacy and perverseness proceed to blemish their younger years (p. 41.)

“ How little knowledge, or thought of God, their Creator and Governor, is found in children when they can distinguish good and evil? What an utter disregard of him that made them, and of the duties they owe to him? And when they begin to act according to their childish age, how little sense have they of what is morally *right* and *good*? How do evil passions or irregular appetites continually prevail in them? Even from their first capacity of acting as moral creatures, how are they led away to practise falsehood and injury to their play-fellows, perhaps with cruelty or revenge? How often are they engaged in bold disobedience to their parents or teachers? And whence does this arise? What is the root that brings forth such early bitter fruit? (p. 42, 43.)

“ It cannot be imputed to custom, education, or example; for many of these things appear in children before they can take any notice of ill examples, or are capable of imitating them. And even

where there are only good examples about them, and where the best and earliest instructions are given them, and inculcated with the utmost care, yet their hearts run astray from God. The far greatest part of them visibly follow the corrupt influences of sense, appetite, passion, and manifest very early the evil principles of stubbornness, pride, and disobedience. (p. 44.)

“ To give a still fuller confirmation of this truth, that mankind have a corrupt nature in them, let it be observed, that where persons have not only had all possible helps of education from their parents, but have themselves taken a religious turn betimes, what a perpetual hinderance do they find within themselves ? What inward oppositions work in their heart, and perhaps interrupt their holy course of life ! What vanity of mind, what irregular appetites, what forgetfulness of God, what evil thoughts and tendencies of heart rise up in contradiction to their best purposes ! Insomuch that ‘ there is not a just man upon earth, who, through his whole life, ‘ doth good and sinneth not.’ (p. 45, 46.)

“ To sum up the three last considerations. If the bulk of mankind are grossly sinful, and if every individual without exception is actually a sinner against the law of his Creator : if sinful propensities appear even in our most tender years ; and every child becomes an actual sinner almost as soon as it becomes a moral agent : then we have just reason to conclude, that there is some original taint spread through the whole race of men from their birth.

“ It has been said indeed, that ‘ if the first man fell into sin, though he was innocent and perfect, then among a million of men, every one might sin, though he was as innocent and perfect as Adam.’ (p. 47.)

“ I answer, There is a bare possibility of the event ; but the improbability of it is in the proportion of a million to one.

“ And I prove it thus. If a million of creatures were made in an equal probability to stand or fall : and if all the numbers from *one* to *one million* inclusively, were set in a rank, it is a million to one that just any single proposed number of all these should fall by sin. Now the total sum is one of these numbers, that is, the last of them. Consequently it is a million to one against the supposition that the whole number of men should fall.

“ And yet farther, if they were all made (as the goodness of God seems to require) in a greater probability of standing than falling, then it is abundantly more than a million to one, that all should sin without exception. And the argument grows still ten thousand times stronger, if we suppose ten thousand millions to have lived since the creation. (p. 48.)

“ 8. That man is a fallen creature, appears further from hence : no man is able by his present natural powers to perform that law of his Creator which is still written upon his heart.” (p. 49.)

“ Does not this law require us to love God with all our hearts, to do to others as we would they should do to us, and to govern our senses, appetites, and passions ; by the rules of reason ? Does it

not require that these things, whether they regard God, ourselves, or others, should be done perfectly, without defect? Doth it not demand, that we should fear, honour, and trust the great God, and obey all his will in a perfect manner? Doth it not prescribe constant justice, truth, and goodness, toward our neighbour, without one covetous wish, one act of the will, or tongue, or hand, contrary to truth or love? Does it not demand, that every sense, appetite, and passion, should be perfectly subject to reason? Now is there a man on earth, who can say, "I am able by my *natural powers* to do this?" (p. 50.)

"Even the outward temptations to which man is exposed, are evidently too strong, to be effectually and constantly resisted, by his now enfeebled reason and conscience: while at the same time his will, his appetites, and passions, have a powerful propensity to comply with them." (p. 51.)

"Now would a just, a wise, and merciful God have formed intellectual creatures, in such a wretched state, with powers and capacities so much below their duties, that they break his law daily and continually, and are not able to help it?" (p. 52.)

"Should it be said, 'God cannot require more than we are able to perform.' You have an answer in your own bosom. For you know and feel God does require this, even by the law he has written in your heart: yet you feel you are not able to perform it, untie or cut the knot how you may.

"Should it be said again, 'God pities and pardons feeble creatures,' I answer, 1. According to the covenant of grace he does, but not according to the law of creation. But, 2. Did God make some of his noblest creatures, so feeble in their original state, as continually to offend, and want pardon? Did he give them such a law as should never, never be fulfilled by any one of them? Would a God who adjusts the proportions of all things with the exactest wisdom, give a law to his creatures so disproportionate to their original powers, that even in the state of their creation, they are under a necessity of breaking it, and stand in need of daily forgiveness? Does not this single consideration prove, that man is now a degenerate being, and not such as he was at first created, by the wise, the righteous, the merciful God?" (p. 54.)

"If you who are most unwilling to acknowledge the fall of man, would but look into yourself daily, and observe all the sinful and irregular turns of your own heart: how propense you are to folly, in greater or less instances, how soon appetite and passion oppose reason and conscience: how frequently you fall short of the demand of the perfect law of God: how thoughtless and forgetful you are of your Creator, how cold and languishing your affection to him: how little delight you have in virtue, or in communion with God: could you think you are such an innocent and holy creature as God at first created you? And that you have been such even from your childhood! Surely a more accurate observation of your own heart must convince you, that you yourself are degenerated from the first rectitude of your nature." (p. 55.)

9. "Another proof of the degeneracy of mankind is this, they are evidently under the displeasure of God, which could not be in their primeval state. As we have taken a short view of *the sins of men*, let us also briefly survey the *miseries of mankind*, and see how these consist with their being in the favour of God. (p. 56.)

" Think on the thousands of rational creatures descending hourly to the grave: a few, by some sudden stroke: but far the greater part by painful and slow approaches. The grave! A dark and shameful prison! Which would never have been made for creatures persisting in innocence, and abiding in the favour of him that gave them life and being. Death is the wages of sin; and from this punishment of sin, none of mankind can claim a discharge.

" Had they stood, can we think any of them would have died? Much less every one of them? And especially that half the human race should have been doomed to die before seven years old? Before they reach the tenth part of the present age of man, or have done any thing in life worth living for? (p. 57.)

" But let us proceed to other miseries that attend us, and hasten us down to the grave.

" Think next of the multitudes that are racked day and night by the gout and stone, the cholic and rheumatism, and all manner of acute and painful diseases: and then say, Would a merciful God have contrived these torments for sinless creatures? Think of the dismal scenes of war and bloodshed that have by times overspread all nations! Cast your thought on a field of battle, where thousands of men are destroyed like brute beasts, and perish by sharp and bloody strokes, or by the fatal engines of death. See thousands more lie on the cold ground, with their flesh and limbs battered and torn, wounded and panting in extreme anguish, till the murmuring soul takes its flight! Are these the signals of their Maker's love, and of his image in which they were created? (p. 59.)

" Think of the numbers that are swallowed up in the mighty waters, by the rage of stormy winds and seas. Review the multitudes that have been swept away by the pestilence, or consumed by the tedious agonies of famine. Would famine and pestilence, with all the train of lingering horrors which attend them, have ever been made for innocent creatures, to have swept away whole nations of them of every age and sex, men, women, and children, without distinction? (p. 59.)

" Think yet again, what numbers of men have been crushed into miseries and death, and buried by earthquakes. Or have had their bones disjointed, and their flesh painfully battered by the fall of houses: perhaps buried alive in the ruins of entire towns or villages, while their neighbours have been drowned in multitudes, by the dismal eruptions of water, or destroyed by deluges of liquid fire bursting out of the earth. Would a God of goodness and justice have treated innocent creatures in this manner? (p. 60.)

" Carry your thoughts to the countries of those savages, where thousands of their conquered enemies, or prisoners of war, are

offered in sacrifice to their idols, or tortured and roasted to death by slow fires ! Add this to all the former miseries, and then let calm reflection say, whether this world does not look like a province half forsaken of its gracious Governor ?

“Some perhaps will say, it is but a small part of mankind, who are involved in these dreadful calamities : and they may suffer peculiar afflictions, for their own personal iniquities. (p. 61.)

“I answer, Take a just survey of those who have suffered thus, and there is not the least reason to think they were sinners above others. Do not these calamities spread through whole countries and involve the best and the worst of men together ? Whole nations suffer by them at once. And indeed such is the corruption of human nature, that wherever they come they find none innocent. And it is the general situation of mankind, under the just displeasure of God, which exposes them to such destruction.

“But to proceed. Think of the innumerable common misfortunes that attend human life ! What multitudes perish by these in one week ! And how much larger a number do these accidents injure and fill their lives with pain, though they are not brought immediately to the grave ! Think of the mischiefs which one part of mankind, in every place, are continually contriving or practising against the other. Take a view of these extensive and reigning evils, and then say whether this world be not a part of the creation of God, which bears plain marks of its Creator’s displeasure ? (p. 62.)

“Much is added to the heap of human miseries by the sorrows that arise from the daily loss of our dearest comforts. What groans and wailings of the living surround the pillows of dying friends or relations ! What symptoms of piercing distress attend the remains when they are conveyed to the grave ! By such losses, the comforts of future life lose their relish, and the sorrows are doubly embittered. (p. 63.)

“In the civilized parts of the world, there is scarcely one person sick or in pain, miserable or dying, but several others sustain a considerable share of misery, by the strong ties of nature or friendship. This diffuses a personal calamity through whole families. This multiplies human miseries into a new and endless number. Add to this, not only the unkindness or falsehood of those from whom we expected the tenderest affection, but the anguish which springs from all our own uneasy and unruly passions. Bring in here all the wrath and resentment in the hearts of men, all the envy and malice that burn within, all the imaginary fears, and the real terrors of future distress coming upon us, all the rage and despair of lost blessings that were once within our hopes, and all the ferments of animal nature which torment the spirit all day, and forbid our nightly repose. Would mankind be in such a condition as this if they were still in the favour of their Maker ? (p. 64.)

“Yes, men may make miseries for themselves, and be punished by them. But compare the sorrows which any man necessarily suffers, with the comforts he enjoys, and the one will balance the other.

Or if his sorrows outweigh his comforts, this may be necessary in a state of trial: and God will reward the over-balance of sufferings hereafter." (p. 65.)

"I answer, There is no reason to think the far greater part of mankind will have any reward hereafter; and if not, how shall we account for this over-balance of sufferings with regard to them? Therefore we cannot reasonably impute their superior sorrows merely to their being in a state of probation: but rather to the displeasure of the righteous Creator and Governor of the world. (p. 66.)

10 "To make this still clearer. Not only those who are grown up in the practice of iniquity, who may be punished for their own sins, but all mankind in their very infancy bear the tokens of God's displeasure.

"Before children are capable of committing sin, they are subject to a thousand miseries. What anguish and pain are they frequently exposed to, even as they are coming into the world, and as soon as they are entered into it. What agonies await their birth! What numerous and acute maladies are ready to attack them! What gripes, what convulsions, what inward torments, which bring some of them down to death, within a few hours or days after they have begun to live! And if they survive a few months, what torture do they find in breeding their teeth, and other maladies of infancy, which can be told only by shrieks and tears, and that for whole days and nights together! What additional pains do they often sustain by the negligence of their mothers, or cruelty of their nurses, whereby many of them are brought down to the grave, either on a sudden or by slow and painful degrees? (p. 67.)

"And what shall we say of whole nations in elder times, and some even at this day, who when they cannot or will not maintain them, expose their children in the woods to be torn and devoured by the next wild beast that passes by! Add to this the common calamities in which infants are involved by fire, earthquake, pestilence. And there are a thousand other accidents which attend them, whereby their members, their natural powers, receive dismal injuries: so that perhaps they drag on through life with blindness, deafness, lameness, or distortion of body or limbs. Sometimes they languish on to manhood, or even old age, under sore calamities, which began almost as soon as their being, and which are only ended by death. (p. 68.)

"Now as these sufferings cannot be sent upon them to correct their personal sins, so neither are they sent as a trial of their virtue: for they have no knowledge of good or evil. Yet we see multitudes of these little, miserable beings. And are these treated as innocent creatures? Or rather as under some general curse, involved in some general punishment? (p. 69.)

"But may not these sufferings of children be for the punishment of the sins of their parents?" (p. 71.)

"Not with any justice or equity, unless the sins of the parents are

imputed to their children. Besides, many of the parents of these suffering children are dead or absent, so as never to know it. And how in these cases can it be a punishment for their parent's sin, any otherwise than as it is a general punishment for the sin of their first parent?

"But God recompenses them for these sufferings hereafter." Where does the Scripture affirm this? Besides many of them grow up to manhood. And if they prove wicked and are sent to hell at last, what recompense have they for their infant sufferings? Or will you say, God punished them before they had sinned, because he knew beforehand they would sin? Yet farther: what wise or good design can this their punishment answer, when no creature can know what they are punished for, if it be not for that which affects all mankind?

"But how are such miseries reigning among his creatures consistent with the goodness of God?" Perfectly well; if we consider mankind as a sinful, degenerate part of God's creation. It is most abundant goodness that they have any comforts left, and that their miseries are not doubled. Now the inspired writers do consider mankind as fallen from God; and so his goodness is evident in a thousand instances: though it must be confessed there are also a thousand instances of his just hatred of sin, and his righteous punishments among all nations. (p. 73.)

11. "If we put together all these scenes of vice and misery, it is evident that creatures lying in such deplorable circumstances, are not such as they came out of the hands of their Creator, who is wise, holy, and good. His wisdom, which is all harmony and order, would not suffer him to frame a whole race of beings, under such wild and innumerable disorders, moral as well as natural. His holiness would not permit him to create beings with innate principles of iniquity: nor his goodness to produce a whole order of creatures in such circumstances of pain, torment, and death. (p. 74.)

"Could the holy and blessed God originally design and frame a whole world of intelligent creatures, in such circumstances, that every one of them coming into being, according to the laws of nature, in a long succession of ages, in different climates, of different constitutions and tempers, and in ten thousand different stations and conditions of life: that every one of them should break the laws of reason, and more or less defile themselves with sin? That every one should offend his Maker, every one become guilty in his sight? Every one expose himself to God's displeasure, to pain, and misery, and mortality, without one single exception? If men were such creatures as God at first made them, would not one man among so many millions have made a right use of his reason and conscience, and so have avoided sin and death? Would this have been the universal consequence of their original constitution, as framed by the hand of a wise, holy, merciful God? What can be more absurd to imagine than this? Surely God made man upright and happy: nor could all these mischiefs have come directly from our Creator's hand. (p. 75, 76.)

“ Is it objected, that ‘ still the greater part of men have more moral good than evil in them, and have more pleasure than pain ; and therefore, on the whole, *mankind are sinful and miserable* ; and that even the best human constitutions, lay some innocent persons, under unavoidable hardships.’ I answer, 1. In order to pronounce a man *miserable*, he must have more pain than pleasure : but in order to pronounce a man a *sinner*, there is no need, that his moral evil should exceed his good. If a man had a hundred virtues, one vice would make him a criminal in the sight of God : one transgression of the law of his Creator, would lay him under his just displeasure. He that keeps the whole law, except in one point, affronts that authority which requires all obedience. All men therefore are under this condemnation ; they are *sinners every one of them.* (p. 77.)

“ As to misery, let it be supposed (though by no means granted) that there are many whose pleasures exceed their uneasiness : yet it is certain, there are more, whose pains and uneasiness far exceed their pleasures. And it is hard to conceive, how this should be, if all men were innocent and happy by nature.

“ I answer, 2. Men are not able to frame such constitutions in every case, as shall secure happiness to all the innocent. Their narrow views of things do not enable them to provide against all future inconveniences. But it is not thus with the Creator and Governor of all things. He views at once all possibles and all futures. Therefore he is well able to guard against any inconvenience that might befall innocent beings. (p. 78.)

“ I answer, 3. Though the bulk of mankind were happy in the present constitution of things, this gives no manner of satisfaction to any one individual, who is unhappy, without any demerit : the advantage of the majority is no reason at all, why any one innocent should suffer. If any one therefore, man or child, and much more, if numbers of them, have more pain than pleasure, they must be involved in some guilt, which may give just occasion to their misery. (p. 79.)

12. “ To enforce this, after the survey of these pains and sorrows, let us consider what are the pleasures of the bulk of mankind. Cast a glance at the sports of *children*, from five to fifteen years of age. What toys and toolries are these ? Would a race of wise and holy beings, waste so many years of early life in such wretched trifles ? And as for our *manly years*, what are the greatest part of the delights of men, but silly and irrational, if not grossly sinful ? What are the pleasures even of the *rich* and *great*, to relieve them under the common sorrows of life ? If they be not luxury and intemperance, are they not furniture and equipage, finery of dress and gay appearances ? To shine in silks of various dye, and blaze in the splendour of gold and jewels ? Now would wise and holy creatures have made this the matter of their joy and pleasure, *My coat is gayer than your's, and I have more glittering things about me than you have !* (p. 80, 81.)

“ Others call for *cards* or *dice*, to divert their trouble and pass away their time. How inexpressibly trifling are these sports, if mere diversion be sought therein ? But if the design be gain, how is the

gave mingled with uneasy fears, with the working of various passions ? Which in case of disappointment and loss, often break out into wrath and fury !

“ Again. What multitudes drench themselves in gross sensualities, as their chief delight ? They make a god of their belly, till they overload nature, and make haste to disease and death. They drown their cares and their senses together ; or they bury them in sensual impurities. (p. 82.)

“ Others release themselves from the troubles of life, by gadding abroad and mixing with impertinent company. Some delight in wanton jest, in foolish merriment, in mean and trifling conversation ; a little above the chattering of monkeys in a wood, or the chirping of crickets upon a hearth. Nay, perhaps it is their diversion, to rail at their neighbours, to murder the reputation of the absent. This is their mirth and recreation ; these their reliefs against the common miseries of human life ! (p. 83.)

“ But would a race of innocent beings flee to such mean and foolish, or criminal refuges from pain as these ? Would they pursue such vain and vile delights ? Would they become rivals to the beasts of the field ? Or sport themselves as devils do, in accusing their fellow-creatures ? Surely if we survey the very *pleasures*, as well as the *sorrows*, of the bulk of mankind, we may learn from thence, that we are by no means such creatures as we were originally created.

“ I need but add one more proof of the general ruin of human nature. We are all posting to the grave. Every one of us are succeeding our neighbours, into some unknown, invisible world. And we all profess to believe this. Yet how exceedingly few are solicitous about this great and awful futurity ? Though we are exposed to so many sins and miseries in this life, and are hastening visibly and hourly to the end of it, yet how few are there that make any careful preparation for a better state than this ! What multitudes are daily running down into darkness, speeding to an endless duration in an unknown country, without any earnest inquiries about the manner of existence there ! They walk over the busy stage of life, they toil and labour, or play and trifle awhile here, and then plunge into a strange, unseen world, where they will meet with a just and holy God, whose wisdom will assign them a place and portion suited to their own character. Now were men indeed wise and holy, could they remain so ignorant and thoughtless of that state, into which they are all hastening ? Or could a gracious God create a race of beings, in such a stupid insensibility of their eternal interests, so unsuited to the felicities of an immortal spirit, and so negligent of all preparations for them ? (p. 85.)

“ Upon this whole survey, reason must join in this mournful confession, that there must be some spreading poison which has tainted our nature, made us so sinful and miserable, so thoughtless of the future, and unprepared for it. There must have been some general revolt of mankind from their Creator, whereby they have ruined their innocence and peace, and provoked the anger of the

Maker, whereby they become exposed to such wretched circumstances, even in their infancy and childhood, as well as when they grow to years of ripe understanding. (p. 86.)

“ And methinks when I take a just survey of this world, with all the inhabitants of it, I can look upon it no otherwise, than as a grand and magnificent structure in ruins : wherein lie millions of rebels against their Creator, under condemnation to misery and death : who are at the same time sick of a moral distemper, and disordered in their minds even to distraction. Hence proceed those numberless follies and vices which are practised here ; and the righteous anger of an offended God visible in ten thousand instances. Yet are there proclamations of divine grace, health and life sounding among them ; though very few take any notice thereof. Only here and there one attends to the call, and complies with the proposals of peace. His sins are pardoned and healed. And though his body goes down to the dust for a season, his soul is happy with God : while the bulk of those criminals, despising all the offers of mercy, perish in their own wilful madness ! (p. 89, 90.)

“ What is the chief temptation that leads some men to deny so glaring a truth ? Is it that they cannot give a satisfactory account of some of the difficulties that attend it ? Nay, many even of the heathen philosophers believed it, from their own experience, and their daily survey of mankind : though they were utterly at a loss, how to account for it. And what if we could not assign a sufficient and satisfactory reason for it ? Or show how this spreading degeneracy began, or how it came to take place so universally ? What if we were still at a loss to explain how all this guilt and misery came upon us, must we therefore deny the things which we see and hear, and feel daily ? (p. 91.)

“ Can we account for all the secret things in the creation of God ? And must we deny whatever we cannot account for ? Does any man refuse to believe, that the infinite variety of plants and flowers, in all their beauteous colours and forms, grow out of the same earth, because he does not know all the springs of their vegetation ? Do men doubt of a loadstone’s drawing iron to itself, because they cannot find out the way of its operation ? Are we not sure that food nourishes our bodies, and medicines relieve our pains ? Yet we know not all the ferments and motions of those atoms, by which we are relieved and nourished. Why then should we deny that degeneracy of our nature, which admits of so full and various proof, though we are not able to account for every circumstance relating to it, or to solve every difficulty that may attend it ? ” (p. 92.)

QUESTION II.

How came Vice and Misery to overspread Mankind in all Nations and in all Ages? (p. 94.)

“HEATHEN Philosophers could never answer this : but Christians may, from the Oracles of God.

These inform us, that the first man was a *common head and representative of all mankind* : and that he by sinning against his Maker, lost his holiness and happiness : and exposed himself and his posterity (whom he naturally produced and whom he legally represented) to the displeasure of his Maker, and so spread sin and misery through his whole offspring. (p. 102.)

So St. Paul, ‘As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.’ (Rom. v. 12.) All are esteemed in some sort guilty before God, though they ‘did not sin after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.’ They did not commit actual personal sin against a known law as Adam did.

“This may more fully appear from the following particulars.

“1. It is plainly taught us in Scripture, that God at first created one man and woman called Adam and Eve ; and from them is derived the whole race of mankind : ‘God hath made of one blood,’ as the apostle observes, ‘all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth.’

2. “God created man at first in a holy and happy state, in his own likeness, and in his favour. (p. 160.) ‘And God said, let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness.’ (Gen. i. 26.) And that none of the brute creation might molest him, but all of them be for his service, he said, ‘Let them have dominion over the fish, and the fowl, and the cattle.’—‘So God created man in his own image.’ And what this image consisted in, beside his spiritual and immortal nature, and his dominion over other creatures, we are told by St. Paul, where he speaks of the ‘new man, which,’ says he, ‘after God,’ that is, after the likeness of God, ‘is created in righteousness and true holiness.’ (Eph. iv. 24.) So Solomon assures us, ‘God made man upright.’ And Moses says, when God had finished all his creation, ‘God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.’ It was all according to his idea and his will, and well-pleasing in his sight. Man, the last of his creatures, as well as all the rest, *was very good*, was holy and happy.

3. “God originally appointed that Adam when innocent should produce an offspring in his own holy image : and on the other hand that if he sinned, he should propagate his kind in his own sinful image. The former is allowed. The latter may be gathered from Gen. v. 1—5, ‘In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him :—‘And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years’

after his loss of the image of God, and ‘begat a son in his own likeness, after his image,’ that is, his own sinful and mortal image.

“ It is not to be supposed, that Moses in this brief history of the first generations of men, should so particularly repeat *the image and likeness of God* in which Adam was created, unless he had designed to set the comparison in a fair light, between Adam’s begetting a son in his own sinful and mortal *image*, whereas he himself was created in God’s holy and immortal *image*. (p. 162.)

4. “ God was pleased to put the man whom he had made upon a trial of his obedience for a season. He placed him in a garden of Eden, (or pleasure,) and gave him a free use of all the creatures: only forbidding him to eat of the fruit of one tree, ‘The tree of the knowledge of good and evil.. For in the day (said he) that thou eatest of it, thou shalt surely die.’ In which threatening were doubtless included all evils: death spiritual, temporal, and eternal. (p. 163.)

5. “ As Adam was under a law; whose sanction threatened death upon disobedience, so doubtless God favoured him with a covenant of life, and a promise of life and immortality upon his obedience. (p. 164.)

6. “ Adam broke the law of his Maker, lost his image and his favour, forfeited the hope of immortality, and exposed himself to the wrath of God, and all the punishments which he had threatened: in consequence of which he was now painfully afraid of him in whom he before delighted: and foolishly endeavoured ‘to hide himself from the presence of the Lord.’ (p. 168.)

7. “ Adam after his sin propagated his kind according to the law of nature: not in the moral image or likeness of God, not ‘in righteousness and true holiness,’ but in his own sinful likeness, with irregular passions, corrupt appetites and inclinations. (p. 170, 171.) To this degeneracy Job manifestly refers in those expressions, ‘What is man that he should be clean, or the son of man that he should be righteous? Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.’ And David says the same thing. ‘Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.’

“ This is not a hyperbolical aggravation of David’s early sins and propensity to evil from his childhood. But the text is strong and plain in asserting sin some way to belong to his very conception, and to be conveyed from his natural parents, which is a different idea from his actual sins, or propensity to sin in his infancy. It shows the cause both of this propensity and of his actual sins, which operated before he was born. So that if original pravity be not so conveyed and derived as is here asserted, the words are not an *exaggeration of what is, but a downright fiction of what is not.*

8. “ As Adam produced his offspring, like himself, destitute of the image of God, so he produced them destitute of the favour of God, under the same condemnation with himself. (p. 174, 175.) So Job: ‘Man that is born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble:’ (ch. xiv. 1.) i. e. His short life and his troubles proceed from his

very birth : his propagation from sinful and mortal parents. Otherwise God would not have appointed his noblest creature in this world to have been ‘born to trouble.’ Yet this is the case. ‘Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward.’ (Job v. 7.) Naturally : for it is owing to his birth and his natural derivation from a sinful stock. We are a miserable race, springing from a corrupted and dying root, prone to sin, and liable to sorrows and sufferings.

“ In proof of this sentence of condemnation and death coming upon all mankind for the sin of Adam, we need only read from the 12th verse of the 5th chapter of St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans, (p. 175:) on which I observe.

1. “ Here Adam and Christ are set up as distinct heads or representatives, of their several families. Adam was the head of all mankind, who became sinful and mortal through his sin : Christ was the head of all believers, who obtain pardon and life through his righteousness. To prove this headship of Adam, the apostle says, ‘ Until the law,’ that is, from the creation till the law of Moses, ‘ sin was in the world ; but sin is not imputed where there is no law.’ That is, where there is no law or constitution of duty or penalty at all. Yet, saith he, ‘ Death reigned from Adam to Moses :’ yet sin was imputed and punished by death, even upon all mankind, both small and great, before the law given by Moses. The inference is, Therefore there was some law or constitution during all the time from Adam to Moses : in virtue of which, sin was imputed to mankind ; and death accordingly executed upon them. Now what law or constitution could this be, beside that which was said to Adam, as a representative of his whole posterity, ‘ In the day thou sinnest thou shalt die ?’ (p. 177, 178.)

2. “ The apostle carries his argument yet farther, ‘ Sin was imputed,’ and ‘ death reigned,’ or was executed ‘ even upon those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression :’ who had not broken an express command, as Adam had done. This manifestly refers to infants : death reigned over them ; death was executed upon them. And this must be by some constitution which in some sense imputed sin, to them who had not committed actual sin. For without such a constitution sin would never have been imputed, nor death executed on children.

“ Yet, 3. Death did not come upon them as a mere *natural* effect of their father Adam’s sin and death : but as a proper and legal punishment of sin. (p. 179:) for it is said, his sin brought *condemnation* upon all men. Now this is a legal term, and shows, that death is not only a natural, but a penal evil, and comes upon infants as guilty and *condemned* ; not for their own actual sins ; for they had none : but for the sin of Adam their legal head, their appointed representative.

“ In the 18th verse the expression is very strong, ‘ By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.’ All the children of Adam, young and old, are *condemned* for his *one offence*. But farther,

4. “ In the original it is not, *By the offence of one* : but *By one*

offence. By the single offence of Adam, when he stood as the head of all his offspring, and brought sin and death upon them by his disobedience: as, in the following verse, ‘By one man’s disobedience many were made, or constituted sinners;’ that is, became liable to guilt and death. And so in the 16th verse, one single offence is represented as condemning through Adam, and stands in opposition to the many *offences* which are pardoned through Christ.

5. “There is a yet farther proof in this chapter that Adam conveyed sin and death to his posterity, not merely, as a natural parent, but as a common head and representative of all his offspring. (p. 181.) As Adam and Christ are here said to be the two springs of sin and righteousness, of death and life to mankind, so the one is represented as a *type* and *figure* of the other. In this very respect Adam was a *figure* or *type of Christ.* (ver. 14.) And for this very reason Christ is called, *the Second Man, the last Adam.* As one was the spring of life, so the other was the spring of death, to all his seed or offspring. (1 Cor. xv. 47—49.)

“Now Christ is a spring of life not only as he conveys sanctification or holiness to his seed, but as he procures for them justification and eternal life by his personal obedience. And so Adam is a spring of death, not only as he conveys an unholy nature to his seed, to all men, but as he brings condemnation to eternal death upon them, by his personal disobedience. And this is the chief thing which the apostle seems to have in his eye throughout the latter part of this chapter: the conveyance of condemnation and death to the seed of Adam, of justification and eternal life to the seed of Christ, by the means of what their respective heads or representatives had done.

“But some object, ‘all the blessings which God gave at first to Adam, consisted in these three particulars, 1. The blessing of propagation.—2. Dominion over the brutes.—3. The image of God. But all these three are more expressly and emphatically pronounced to Noah and his sons than to Adam in Paradise.’ (p. 183.)

“I answer, if we review the history and context, we shall find the blessing of Adam and that of Noah, very widely differ from each other, in all the three particulars mentioned. (p. 186.)

“1. The blessing of Adam relating to propagation, was without those multiplied pains and sorrows, which after the first sin, fell upon women, in bearing children. It was also a blessing of sustentation or nourishment, without hard toil and the sweat of his brow. It was a blessing without a curse on the ground, to lessen or destroy the fruitfulness thereof. It was a blessing without death, without returning to dust: whereas the blessing of Noah, did not exclude death, no nor the pains of child-birth, nor the earning our bread by the sweat of our brow.

“2. To Adam was given *dominion over the brutes.* To Noah it was only said, ‘The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast.’ But notwithstanding this fear and dread, yet they frequently sting men to death, or bite and tear them in pieces. Whereas

no such calamity could ever have befallen innocent Adam or his innocent offspring. (p. 187.)

“ 3. The *image of God* in which Adam was created, consisted eminently in righteousness and true holiness. But that part of the *image of God* which remained after the fall, and remains in all men to this day, is the *natural image of God*, namely the spiritual nature and immortality of the soul: not excluding the *political image of God*, or a degree of dominion over the creatures still remaining. But the moral image of God is lost and defaced: or else it could not be said to be renewed. (p. 188.) It is then evident, that the blessing given to Adam in innocence, and that given to Noah after the Flood, differ so widely, that the latter was consistent with the condemnation or curse for sin, and the former was not. Consequently mankind does not now stand in the same favour of God, as Adam did while he was innocent. (p. 189.)

“ Thus it appears, that the Holy Scripture both in the Old and New Testaments, give us a plain and full account, of the conveyance of sin, misery, and death, from the first man to all his offspring

THE FIRST ESSAY.

Do the present Miseries of Man alone prove his Apostacy from God?

SECTION I.

A general Survey of the Follies and Miseries of Mankind.

“ Upon a just view of human nature, (p. 359.) from its entrance into life, till it retires behind the curtain of death, one would be ready to say concerning man, “ Is this the creature that is so superior to the rest of the inhabitants of the globe, as to require the peculiar care of the Creator in forming him? (p. 360.) Does he deserve such an illustrious description, as even the Heathen poet has given us of him?”

*Sanctius hic animal, mentisque capacious A'tæ
D'icit adhuc, et quod dominari in cætera posset.
Natus homo est; sive hunc divino semine cretum
Ille opifex rerum muudi melioris origo
Finxit in Effigiem moderantum cuncta Deorum.
Pronaque cum spectent animalia cætera terram
Os homini sublime dedit, cælumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.*

A creature of a more exalted kind,
Was wanting yet, and then was man design'd:
Conscious of thought, of more capacious breast,
For empire form'd, and fit to rule the rest.
Whether with particles of heavenly fire,
The God of Nature did his soul inspire,
And moulding up a mass in shape like our's,
Form'd a bright image of th' all-ruling powers.
And while the mute creation downward bend
Their sight, and to their earthly mother tend,
Man looks aloft, and with erected eyes,
Beholds his own hereditary skies.

“ Now if man was formed in the image of God, certainly he was a holy and a happy being. But what is there like holiness or happiness now found, running through this rank of creatures? Are there any of the brutal kind that do not more regularly answer the design of their creation? Are there any brutes that we ever find acting so much below their original character, on the land, in the water, or the air, as mankind does all over the earth? Or are there any tribes among them, through which pain, vexation, and misery, are so plentifully distributed as they are among the children of men? (p. 361.)

“ Were this globe of earth to be surveyed from one end to the other, by some spirit of a superior order, it would be found such a theatre of folly and madness, such a maze of mingled vice and misery, as would move the compassion of his refined nature, to a painful degree, were it not tempered by a clear sight of that wise and just providence, which strongly and sweetly works in the midst of all; and will in the end bring good out of all evil, and justify the ways of God with man. (p. 362.)

SECT. II.

A particular View of the Miseries of Man.

“ But to waive for the present the sins and follies of mankind, may we not infer from his miseries alone, that we are degenerate beings bearing the most evident marks of the displeasure of our Maker? (p. 363.)

“ View the histories of mankind, and what is almost all history, but a description of the wretchedness of men, under the mischiefs they bring upon themselves, and the judgments of the Great God! The scenes of happiness and peace are very thin set among all the nations: and they are rather a transient glimpse, here and there, than any thing solid and durable. (p. 364.) But if we look over the universe, what public desolations by plague and famine, by storms and earthquakes, by wars and pestilence! What secret mischiefs reign among men, which pierce and torture the soul! What smarting, wounds and bruises, what pains and diseases attack and torment the animal frame!

“ Where is the family of seven or eight persons wherein there is not one or more afflicted with some troublesome malady, or tiresome inconvenience? These indeed are often concealed by the persons who suffer them, and by the families where they dwell. But were they all brought together, what *hospitals* or *infirmaries* would be able to contain them? (p. 365.)

“ What toils and hardships, what inward anxieties and sorrows, disappointments and calamities are diffused through every age and country? Do not the rich feel them as well as the poor? Are they not all teased with their own appetites, which are never satisfied?

And their impetuous passions give them no rest. What keen anguish of mind arises from pride, and envy, and resentment? What tortures does ambition, or disappointed love, or wild jealousy infuse into their bosoms? Meanwhile the poor, together with inward vexations and corroding maladies of the mind, sustain likewise endless drudgeries in procuring their necessary subsistence. And how many of them cannot after all, procure even food to eat and raiment to put on? (p. 366.)

“Survey man through every stage. See first what a figure he makes, at his entrance into life! ‘This animal,’ says Pliny, ‘who is to govern the rest of the creatures, how he lies bound hand and foot all in tears, and begins his life in misery and punishment.’ If we trace the education of the human race, from the cradle to mature age, especially among the poor, who are the bulk of all nations, the wretchedness of mankind will farther appear. How are they every where dragged up in their tender age, through a train of nonsense, madness, and miseries? (p. 367.) What millions of uneasy sensations do they endure in infancy and childhood by reason of those pressing necessities, which for some years they can tell only in cries and groans, and which either their parents are so poor they cannot relieve, or so savage and brutish that they will not? How wretchedly are these young generations hurried on through the folly and weakness of childhood, till new calamities arise from their own ungoverned appetites and impetuous passions? As youth advances, the ferments of the blood rise higher, and the appetites and passions grow much stronger, and give more abundant vexation to the race of mankind, than they do to any of the brutal creation. And whereas the all-wise God, for kind reasons, has limited the gratification of these appetites by rules of virtue; perhaps these very rules through the corruption of our nature irritate mankind to greater excesses. (p. 368.)

“Would the affairs of human life in infancy, childhood, and youth, have ever been in such a sore and painful situation, if man had been such a being as God at first made him, and had continued in the favour of his Maker? Could divine wisdom and goodness admit of these scenes, were there not a degeneracy through the whole race, which by the just permission of God, exerts itself some way or other in every stage of life? (p. 370.)

“Follow mankind to the age of public appearance upon the stage of the world, and what shall we find there but infinite cares, labours, and toil, attended with fond hopes almost always frustrated with endless crosses and disappointments, through ten thousand accidents that are every moment flying across this mortal stage? As for the poor, how does the sultry toil exhaust their lives in summer, and what starving wretchedness do they feel in winter? How is a miserable life sustained among all the pains and fatigues of nature with the oppression, cruelty, and scorn of the rich? (p. 371.)

“Let us follow on the track to the close of life. What a scene is presented us in old age? How innumerable and how inexpressible are the disasters and sorrows, the pains and aches, the groans and

wretchedness, that meet man on the borders of the grave, before they plunge him into it ?

“ And indeed is there any person on earth, high or low, without such distresses and difficulties, such crossing accidents and perplexing cares, such painful infirmities in some or other part of life, as must pronounce mankind upon the whole a miserable being ? Whatever scenes of happiness seem to attend him, in any shining hour, a dark cloud soon casts a gloom over them, and the pleasing vision vanishes as a dream !

“ And what are the boasted pleasures which some have supposed to balance the sorrows of life ? Are not most of them owing in a good degree, to some previous uneasiness ? It is the pain of hunger which makes food so relishing ; the pain of weariness that renders sleep so refreshing. And as for the blessings of love and friendship, among neighbours and kindred, do they not often produce as much vexation as satisfaction ? Not indeed of themselves ; but by reason of the endless humours and follies, errors and passions of mankind. (p. 373.)

“ Again. Do not the very pleasures of the body prove the ruin of ten thousand souls ? They may be used with innocence and wisdom ; but the unruly appetites and passions of men, continually turn into a curse, what God originally designed for a blessing. (p. 374.)

“ Think again how short and transient are the pleasures of life in comparison of the pains of it ! How vanishing the sweetest sensations of delight ! But in many persons and families, how many are the days, the months, the years, of fatigue, or pain, or bitter sorrow ? What pleasure of the animal frame is either as lasting, or as intense as the pain of the gout or stone ? How small is the proportion of sensible pleasure, to that of pain or trouble, or uneasiness ? And how far is it over-balanced by the miseries, the fears or sorrows of the greatest part of mankind ?

“ As for intellectual pleasures, how few are there in the world, who have any capacity for them ? And among those few, how many differences and contentions, how many crossing objections, bewildered inquiries, and unhappy mistakes are mingled with the enjoyment ? So that ‘ he who increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow,’ saith the wisest of men, and upon the whole computation, he writes on this also, ‘ Vanity and vexation of spirit.’

“ To talk then of real happiness to be enjoyed in this life (abstracted from the foretaste of another) is contrary to all the common sense and experience of every thinking man. Without this ‘ taste of the powers of the world to come,’ I know not what wise man would willingly come into these scenes of mortality, or go through them with any patience. (p. 376, 377.)

“ What, to be trained up from infancy under so many unavoidable follies, prejudices, and wretched delusions through the power of flesh and sense ? To be sunk into such gross ignorance both of our souls, our better selves, and of the glorious Being that made us ? To lie under such heavy shades of darkness, such a world of mistakes

and errors, as are mingled with our little faint glimpses, and low notices of God our Creator? What, to be so far distant from God, and to endure such a long estrangement from the wisest and best of Beings, in this foolish and fleshly state, with so few and slender communications with or from him?

“What, to feel so many powerful and disquieting appetites, so many restless and unruly passions, which want the perpetual guard of a jealous eye, and a strong restraint over them? Otherwise they will be ever breaking out into some new mischief.

“What, to be ever surrounded with such delights of sense, as are constant temptations to folly and sin? To have scarce any joys, but what we are liable to pay dear for, by an excessive or irregular indulgence? Can this be a desirable state? For any wise being who knows what happiness is, to be united to such a disorderly machine of flesh and blood, with all its uneasy and unruly ferment? (p. 378.)

“Add to this another train of inbred miseries which attend this animal frame. What wise spirit would willingly put on such flesh and blood as ours, with all the springs of sickness and pain, anguish and disease in it? What, to be liable to the racking disquietudes of gout and stone, and a thousand other distempers? To have nature worn out by slow and long aches and infirmities, and lie lingering many years on the borders of death, before we can find a grave?

“Solomon seems to be much of this mind, when after a survey of the whole scheme of human life, in its variety of scenes, (without the views of hereafter,) he declares, ‘I praised the dead who were already dead, more than the living who were yet alive.’ And indeed it appears, that the miseries of life are so numerous as to overbalance all its real comforts, and sufficiently to show, that mankind now lie under evident marks of their Maker’s displeasure as being degenerated from that state of innocence, wherein they were at first created. (p. 380.)

SECT. III.

Objections answered.

“But it is objected ‘If human life in general is miserable, how is it, that all men are so unwilling to die?’ (p. 381. 383.)

“I answer, 1. Because they fear to meet with more misery in another life than they feel in this. See our Poet:

“The weariest and most loathed worldly life,
That pain, age, penury, and imprisonment
Can lay on nature, ‘tis a paradise
To what we fear of death.”

And in another place,

“If by the sleep of death we could but end
 The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks
 That flesh is heir to, ‘twere a consummation
 Devoutly to be wished. O who would bear
 The oppressor’s wrongs, the poor man’s contumely,
 The insolence of office, and the spurns
 That patient merit of th’ unworthy takes,
 With all the long calamities of life,
 When he himself might his *quietus* make
 With a bare bodkin? Who would bear such burdens,
 And groan and sweat under a weary life,
 But that the dread of something after death,
 That undiscover’d country, from whose bourne
 No traveller returns, puzzles the will,
 And makes us rather bear those ills we have,
 Than fly to others which are all unknown.”

“If you say, ‘But the Heathens knew nothing of a future life: and yet they too, in all their generations have been unwilling to die. Nor would they put an end to their own life were it ever so miserable.’ (p. 384.) I answer, Most of the ancients (as well as the modern) Heathens, had some notions of an after-state, and some fears of punishment in another life, for sins committed in this. And in the politer nations they generally supposed self-murderers in particular would be punished after death.

*Proxima deinde tenent mæsti loca, qui sibi lethum
 Insontes peperere manu, lucemque perosit
 Projecere animas. Quam vellent æthere in alto
 Nunc et pauperiem et duros perferrere labores!
 Fata obstant: tristique patut infamabilis unda
 Alligat, et novies Styx interfusa coeret.*

The next in place and punishment are they
 Who prodigally threw their lives away.
 Fools, who repining at their wretched state,
 And loathing anxious life have hurried on their fate:
 With late repentance now they would retrieve
 The bodies they forsook, and wish to live:
 All pain and poverty desire to bear,
 To view the light of heav’n, and breathe the vital air.
 But fate forbids: the Stygian floods oppose,
 And with nine circling streams the captive souls enclose.

“I answer, 2. Suppose this love of life and aversion to death are found, even where there is no regard to a future state, this will not prove that *mankind is happy*; but only that the God of nature hath wrought this principle into the souls of all men, in order to preserve the work of his own hands. So that reluctance against dying is owing to the natural principles of self-preservation, without any formed and sedate judgment, whether it is best to continue in this life or not, or whether life has more happiness or misery. (p. 386.)

“It may be objected, secondly, If brutes suffer nearly the same miseries with mankind, and yet have not sinned, how can these miseries prove that man is an apostate being? (p. 389.)

“I answer, it is by reason of man’s apostacy, that even brute animals suffer. ‘The whole creation groaneth together’ on his account, ‘and travaileth together in pain to this day.’ For the brute creation was made subject to vanity, to abuse, pain, corruption,

death, not ‘willingly,’ not by any act of its own, ‘but by reason of him that subjected it:’ of God who in consequence of Adam’s sin, whom he had appointed Lord of the whole lower world, *for his sake* pronounced this curse (not only on the ground, but) on all which was before under his dominion.

“The misery, therefore, of the brute creation, is so far from being an objection to the apostacy of man, that it is a visible standing demonstration thereof. If beasts suffer, then man is fallen.

SECT. IV..

The Apostacy of Man proved by Scripture and Reason.

“But whether or not the miseries of mankind alone will prove their apostacy from God, it is certain these together with the sins of men are an abundant proof, that we are fallen creatures. And this I shall now endeavour to show, both from the express testimony of Scripture, from the necessity of renewing grace, and from a survey of the Heathen world.’ (p. 409, 410.)

“First, The Scripture testifies, that an universal degeneracy and corruption, is come upon all the sons and daughters of Adam. (p. 410.) ‘Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart of man is only evil continually,’ (Gen. vi. 5:) yea ‘evil from his youth.’ (Ch. viii. 21.) ‘The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are gone out of the way: there is none that doth good, no not one.’ (Psm. xiv. 2.) ‘There is not a just man upon earth, who doth good and sinneth not.’ (Eccl. vii. 20.) ‘All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way.’ (Isa. liii. 6.) different wanderings, but all wanderers. ‘There is none righteous, no not one: there is none that doth good, no not one. Every mouth is stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. All are fallen short of the glory of God, because all have sinned.’ (Rom. iii. 10. 12. 19. 23.) ‘If one died for all, then were all dead;’ that is, spiritually dead, dead in trespasses and sins. (2 Cor. v. 14.)

“Now can we suppose, that all God’s creatures would universally break his law, run into sin and death, defile and destroy themselves, and that without any one exception, if it had not arisen from some root of bitterness, some original iniquity which was diffused through them all, from their very entrance into the world? It is utterly incredible, that every single person, among the millions of mankind should be born pure and innocent, and yet should all, by free and voluntary choice, every one for himself, for near six thousand years together, rebel against him that made them, if there were not some original contagion spread through them all at their entrance into life!

“Secondly, The same thing appears from the scriptural doctrine of our recovery by divine grace. Let us consider in what manner the Scripture represents that great change which must be wrought in our souls, in order to our obtaining the favour and image of God, and future happiness. ‘Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.’ (John iii. 3. 6. 8.) In other scripture it is represented, that they ‘must be born of the Spirit;’ they must be ‘born of God.’ They must be, ‘created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works.’ (Eph. ii. 10.) They must ‘be quickened,’ or raised again from their ‘death in trespasses and sins.’ (ver. 5.) They must be, ‘renewed in their spirit,’ or ‘created after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness.’ They must be ‘reconciled to God by Jesus Christ:’ they must be ‘washed from their sins in his blood.’ ‘Since all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,’ therefore if ever they are saved, they must be ‘justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.’ Now can any one suppose God to have made so many millions of creatures, as have come into the world from Adam till now, which have all entered the world, innocent and holy, and yet not one of them should retain his image in holiness, or be fit for his favour, without being *born again, created anew, raised from the dead, redeemed*, not with corruptible things, but ‘with the blood of his own Son?’ Do not all these representations prove, that every man is born with some original contagion, and under some criminal imputation in the sight of God? Else would not one among all these millions be fit to be made a partaker of his favour, without such amazing purifications as require the blood of the Son of God, and the almighty operations of his Spirit? Do not all these things show, that mankind in their present generations, are not such creatures as God at first made them? (p. 414.)

“The same great truth we may learn, thirdly, from even a slight survey of the Heathen nations. A few days ago I was viewing, in the map of the world, the vast Asiatic empires of Tartary and China, and a great part of the kingdom of the Mogul, with the multitude of islands in the East-Indies. I went on to survey all the southern part of Africa, with the savage nations of America. I observed the thousands, or rather millions who dwell on this globe, and walk, and trifle, and live and die there, under the heaviest cloud of ignorance and darkness, not knowing God, nor the way to his favour: who are drenched in gross impieties and superstitions, who are continually guilty of national immoralities, and practise idolatry, malice and lewdness, fraud and falsehood, with scarce any regret or restraint. (p. 415.)

“Then sighing within myself I said, It is not many years since these were all infants; and they were brought up by parents who knew not God, nor the path that leads to life and happiness. Are not these unhappy children born under difficulties almost insurmountable? Are they not laid under almost an impossibility, of breaking their way of themselves, through so much thick darkness, to the

knowledge, the fear, and the love of him that made them ? Dreadful truth indeed ! Yet, so far as I can see, certain and incontestible. Such, I fear, is the case of those of the human race who cover at present the far greatest part of the globe. (p. 416.)

“ Then I ran back in my thoughts four or five thousand years, and said within myself, what multitudes in every age of the world, have been born in these deplorable circumstances ? They are inured from their birth to barbarous customs and impious practices ; they have an image of the life of brutes and devils wrought in them by their early education : they have had the seeds of wretched wickedness, sown, planted, and cultivated in them, by the savage instructions of those that went before them. And their own imitation of such horrible examples has confirmed the mischief, long before they knew or heard of the true God : if they have heard of him to this day. Scarce any of them have admitted one thoughtful inquiry, whether they follow the rules of reason, or whether they are in the way of happiness and peace, any more than their parents before them. As they are born in this gross darkness, so they grow up in the vile idolatries, and all the shameful abominations of their country, and go on to death in the same course. Nor have they light enough, either from without or within to make them ask seriously, ‘ Is there not a lie in my right hand ? Am I not in the way of destruction ? ’ (p. 417.)

“ St. Peter says, indeed, That ‘ in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.’ But if there were very few (among the Jews) who feared God, very few in those learned nations of the Gentiles, how much fewer, may we suppose, are in those barbarous countries, which have no knowledge, either divine or human ? (p. 419.)

“ But would this have been the case of those unhappy nations, both of the parents and their children, in a hundred long successions, had they been such a race of creatures, as they came out of the hand of the Creator ? If those children had been guiltless in the eye of God could this have been their portion ? In short, can we suppose, the wise, and righteous, and merciful God would have established and continued such a constitution for the propagation of mankind, which should naturally place so many millions of them so early in such dismal circumstances ; if there had not been some dreadful and universal degeneracy spread over them and their fathers, by some original crime, which met and seized them at the very entrance into life ? (p. 420.)

THE SECOND ESSAY.

A plain Explication of the Doctrine of ‘ Imputed Sin and Imputed Righteousness.’ (p. 427.)

“ This Doctrine has been attended with many noisy controversies in the Christian world. Let us try whether it may not be set in so

fair and easy a light, as to reconcile the sentiments of the contending parties.

“ When a man has broken the law of his country, and is punished for so doing, it is plain that *sin is imputed to him* : *his wickedness is upon him* ; *he bears his iniquity* : that is, he is reputed or accounted guilty : he is condemned and dealt with as an offender. (p. 428.)

“ On the other hand if an innocent man, who is falsely accused is acquitted by the court, *sin is not imputed to him*, but *righteousness is imputed to him* ; or to use another phrase, *his righteousness is upon him*.

“ Or, if a reward be given a man for any righteous action, this righteous act *is imputed to him*.

“ Farther, If a man has committed a crime, but the prince pardons him, then he is *justified from it* ; and his fault is *not imputed to him*. (p. 429.)

“ But if a man, having committed treason, his estate is taken from him and his children, then they *bear the iniquity of their father*, and his sin is *imputed to them also*.

“ If a man lose his life and estate for murder, and his children thereby become vagabonds, then the blood of the person murdered is said to be *upon the murderer* and *upon his children* also. So the Jews : *His blood be on us and on our children* ; let us and our children be punished for it.

“ Or, if a criminal had incurred the penalty of imprisonment, and the state were to permit a friend of his to become his surety, and to be confined in his room, then his crime is said to be *imputed* to his surety, or to be *laid upon him* : *he bears the iniquity of his friend*, by suffering for him. Meantime the crime for which the surety now suffers, *is not imputed* to the real offender. (p. 430.)

“ And should we suppose the prince, to permit this surety to exert himself in some eminent service, to which a reward is promised, and all this in order to entitle the criminal to the promised reward, then this eminent service may be said to be *imputed* to the criminal, that is, he is rewarded on the account of it. So in this case, both what his friend has done and suffered, *is imputed to him*.

“ If a man do some eminent service to his prince, and he with his posterity are dignified on account of it ; then the service performed by the father is said to be *imputed to the children also*. (p. 431.)

“ Now if among the histories of nations we find any thing of this kind, do we not easily understand what the writers say ? Why then do we judge these phrases when they are found in the inspired writers, to be so hard to be understood ?

“ But it may be asked, how can the acts of the parent’s treason, be *imputed* to his little child ? Since those acts were quite out of the reach of an infant, nor was it possible for him to commit them ? (p. 432.) Or how can the eminent service performed by a father, be *imputed* to his child, who is but an infant ?

“ I answer, 1. Those acts of treason or acts of service, are by a common figure said to be *imputed to the children*, when they suffer or enjoy the consequences of their father’s treason or eminent service :

though the *particular actions* of treason or service, could not be practised by the children. This would easily be understood should it occur in human history. And why not, when it occurs in the sacred writings ? (p. 433.)

“ I answer, 2. *Sin* is taken either for an *act of disobedience* to a law, or for the *legal result* of such an act ; that is, the *guilt* or *liability to punishment*. Now when we say, the sin of a traitor is *imputed to his children*, we do not mean, that the act of the father is charged upon the child : but that the *guilt* or *liability to punishment* is so transferred to him that he suffers banishment or poverty on account of it.

“ In like manner *righteousness* is either, particular acts of *obedience* to a law, or the *legal result* of those actions, that is, a *right to the reward* annexed to them.

“ And so when we say, *The righteousness* of him that has performed some eminent act of *obedience*, is *imputed to his children*, we do not mean, that the particular act of the father is charged on the child, as if he had done it : but that the *right to reward*, which is the result of that act, is transferred to his children.

“ Now if we would but thus explain every text of Scripture wherein either *imputed sin* or *imputed righteousness* is mentioned, (whether in express words, or in the plain meaning of them) we should find them all easy and intelligible. (p. 435.)

“ Thus we may easily understand how the *obedience* of Christ is *imputed* to all his seed : and how the *disobedience* of Adam is *imputed* to all his children. (p. 436.)

“ To confirm this, I would add these three remarks :

1. “ There are several histories in Scripture, where expressions of the same import occur.

“ So Gen. xxii. 16, ‘ Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies, because thou hast obeyed my voice.’ Here Abraham’s *obedience*, that is, the result of it, is *imputed* to his posterity.

“ So Numb. xxv. 11, ‘ God gave to Phinehas and his seed after him the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, because he was zealous for his God,’ and slew the criminals in Israel. This was so *imputed* to his children that they also received the reward of it. (p. 437.)

“ Thus the sin of Acham was so *imputed* to his children, that they were all stoned on account of it. Josh. vii. 24. In like manner the covetousness of Gehazi was *imputed* to his posterity, (2 Kings v. 27,) when God by his prophet pronounced, that the ‘ leprosy should cleave unto him and to his seed for ever.’ (p. 438.)

2. “ The Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, use the words *sin* and *iniquity*, (both in Hebrew and Greek,) to signify not only the criminal *actions* themselves, but also the *result* and *consequences* of those actions, that is, *The guilt* or *liability to punishment* : and sometimes the *punishment* itself, whether it fall upon the original criminal, or upon others on his account. (p. 439.)

“ In the same manner the Scriptures use the word *righteousness*,

not only for acts of obedience, but also the result of them, that is *justification*, or *right to a reward*. A moderate study of some of those texts where these words are used, may convince us of this.

“ So Job xxxiii. 26. ‘ God will render to a man his righteousness :’ that is, the reward of it. Hos. x. 12. ‘ Sow to yourselves in righteousness, till the Lord come and rain righteousness upon you :’ that is, till he pour down the rewards or fruits of it upon you.

“ I might add here, that in several places of St. Paul’s Epistles, *righteousness* means *justification*, in the passive sense of the word. (p. 440.)

“ So Rom. x. 4. ‘ Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth :’ that is, in order to the justification of believers. Rom. x. 10. ‘ With the heart man believeth unto righteousness ;’ that is, so as to obtain justification. Gal. ii. 21. ‘ If righteousness, that is, justification, ‘ come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.’ This particularly holds, where the word *λογιζομαι*, or *impute*, is joined with *righteousness*. As Rom. iv. 3. ‘ Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness.’ Rom. iv. 5. His faith is counted to him for righteousness.’ It is not *αντι*, or *νπει*, *for*, or *instead* of righteousness : but *εις δικαιοσυνην* *in order to justification* or acceptance with God.

“ And in other places of Scripture, a work, whether good or evil, is put for the reward of it. Job. xxxiv. 11. The reward of a man will he render unto him ;’ that is, the recompense of it. So St. Paul desires Philemon, to impute any wrong he had received from Onesimus to himself: that is, not the evil *action*, but the *damage* he had sustained.

“ Indeed when sin or righteousness is said to be imputed to any man, on account of what himself hath done, the words usually denote both the good or evil actions themselves, and the legal result of them. But when the sin or righteousness of one person is said to be imputed to another, then generally those words mean only the result thereof, that is, a liableness to punishment on the one hand, and to reward on the other.

“ But let us say what we will, to confine the sense of the imputation of sin and righteousness, to the *legal result*, the reward or punishment of good or evil actions : let us ever so explicitly deny, the imputation of the *actions* themselves to others, still Dr. Taylor will level almost all his arguments against the imputation of the actions themselves, and then triumph in having demolished what we never built, and refuting what we never asserted.

3. “ The Scripture does not, that I remember, any where say in express words, That the *sin* of *Adam* is *imputed* to his children : or that the *sins* of *believers* are *imputed* to Christ ; or, that the *righteousness* of Christ is *imputed* to believers. But the true meaning of all these expressions is sufficiently found in several places of Scripture. (p. 446.)

“ Yet since these express words and phrases, of the *imputation* of *Adam’s sin to us*, of *our sins* to Christ, and of Christ’s *righteousness to us*, are not plainly written in Scripture ; we should not impose it on every Christian, to use these very expressions. Let every one take

his liberty, either to confine himself to strictly scriptural language ; or of manifesting his sense of these plain, scriptural doctrines, in words and phrases of his own. (p. 447.)

“ But if the words were expressly written in the Bible, they could not reasonably be interpreted in any other sense, than this which I have explained by so many examples, both in Scripture, history, and in common life.

“ I would only add, If it were allowed, that the very act of Adam’s disobedience was imputed to all his posterity ; that all the same sinful actions which men have committed, were imputed to Christ, and the very actions which Christ did upon earth, were imputed to believers : what greater punishments would the posterity of Adam suffer ? Or what greater blessings could believers enjoy, beyond what Scripture has assigned, either to mankind, as the result of the sin of Adam, or to Christ as the result of the sins of men ; or to believers, as the result of the righteousness of Christ ?”

PART V.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

I BELIEVE every impartial reader is now able to judge, whether Dr. Taylor has solidly answered Dr. Watts or not. But there is another not inconsiderable writer whom I cannot find he has answered at all, though he has published four several tracts, professedly against Dr. Taylor : of which he could not be ignorant, because they are mentioned in the “ *Ruin and Recovery of Human Nature.* ” I mean, the Rev. Mr. Samuel Hebden, minister at Wrentham in Suffolk. I think it therefore highly expedient, to subjoin a short abstract of these also ; the rather, because the tracts themselves are very scarce, having been for some time out of print.

ECCLES. vii. 29.

Lo ! this only have I found, That God made Man upright ; but they have sought out many Inventions.

“ IN the preceding verse Solomon had declared, how few wise and good persons he had found in the whole course of his life. But lest any should blame the providence of God for this, he here observes that these were not what God made man at first ; and that their being what they were not, was the effect of a wretched apostacy from God. The original words stand thus, “ *Only see thou, I have found.* ”

— (p. 3.)

“ *Only :* This word sets a mark on what it is prefixed to, as a truth of great certainty and importance. *See, observe, thou.* He invites every hearer and reader, in particular, to consider what he was about to offer. *I have found.* I have discovered this certain truth, and

assert it on the fullest evidence; *That God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.* (p. 4.)

“ The Hebrew word *רִאשׁוֹן*, which we render *upright*, is properly opposed to *crooked, irregular, perverse*. It is applied to things to signify their being *straight*, or agreeable to rule. But it is likewise applied both to God and man, with the words and works of both. As applied to God, the ways of God, the word of God, it is joined with *good*. Psalm xxv. 8: with *righteous*. Psalm cxix. 137; with *true and good*. Neh. ix. 13; where mention is made of *right judgments, true laws, good statutes*. The *uprightness* with which God is said to minister judgment to the people answers to *righteousness*. In a word, God’s *uprightness* is the moral rectitude of his nature, infinitely wise and good, just and perfect. The *uprightness of man*, is his conformity of heart and life to the rule he is under, which is the law or will of God. Accordingly we read of ‘uprightness of heart.’ Psalm xxxvi. 10; Job xxxiii. 3; and *uprightness of way* or conversation. Psalm xxxvii. 14, and often elsewhere. The *upright man* throughout the Scripture, is a truly good man, a man of *integrity*, a holy person. (p. 5, 6.) In Job i. 1. 8, and ii. 3, *upright* is the same with *perfect*. (as in Psalm xxxvii. 37; and many other places,) and is explained by one who feareth God and escheweth evil.’ In Job viii. 6. it is joined, and is the same with, *pure*. In the same sense it is taken (to mention but a few out of many texts which might be produced) Prov. x. 29. The way of the Lord is strength to the upright, but destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity.” Chap. xi. 3. ‘The integrity of the upright shall guide them; but the perverseness of transgressors shall destroy them.’ Ver. 6. ‘The righteousness of the upright shall deliver them; but transgressors shall be taken in their own naughtiness. Ver. 11. By the blessing of the upright the city is exalted. Ch. xv. 8. ‘The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, but the prayer of the upright is his delight.’ Ch. xxi. 29. ‘A wicked man hardeneth his face; but as for the upright, he directeth his way.’ From all these texts it manifestly appears, that *uprightness*, as applied to man, is the very same with *righteousness, holiness, or integrity* of heart and conversation.

“ When therefore Solomon says, ‘God made man upright, the plain, undeniable meaning is, God at first formed man righteous or holy: although ‘they have sought out many inventions. They, this refers to Adam, which is both a singular and a plural noun: they our first parents, and with them their posterity, have sought out many inventions,’ many contrivances to offend God and injure themselves. These *many inventions* are opposed to the *uprightness*, the *simplicity* of heart and *integrity*, with which our first parents, and mankind in them, were originally made by God. (p. 7.)

“ The doctrine of the text then is, that God, at his creation ‘made man upright or righteous;’ not only *rational* and a *free-agent*, but *holy*. Therefore, to maintain, that ‘Man neither was nor could be formed *holy*, because none can be *holy*, but in consequence of his own choice and endeavour,’ is bold indeed! To prove the contrary, and justify Solomon’s assertion, I offer a few plain arguments. (p. 8.)

“ 1. Moses in his account of the creation writes, ‘ And God said, Let us make man in our own image. Now that righteousness or holiness is the principal part of this image of God, appears from Eph. iv. 22. 24. and Col. iii. 9, 10. On which passages I observe. 1. By the *old man* is not meant a *Heathenish life*, or an ungodly conversation; but a *corrupt nature*. For the Apostle elsewhere speaks of ‘ our old man, as crucified with Christ;’ and here distinguishes from it their former conversation, or sinful actions, which he calls the deeds of the old man. 2. By ‘ the new man’ is meant, not a *new course of life*, (as the Socinians interpret it,) but a *principle of grace*, called by St. Peter, ‘ the hidden man of the heart,’ and a *divine nature*.’ 3. ‘ To put off the old man,’ (the same as to ‘ crucify the flesh’) is to subdue and mortify our corrupt nature: to ‘ put on the new man,’ is to stir up and cultivate that gracious principle, that new nature. *This*, saith the Apostle, ‘ is created after God, in righteousness and true holiness. ‘ It is created?’ which cannot properly be said, of a new course of life; but may, of a *new nature*. It is created ‘ after God, or in his image and likeness,’ mentioned by Moses. But what is it to be ‘ created after God,’ or ‘ in his image?’ It is to be created in righteousness and true holiness: (termed *knowledge*, the practical knowledge of God. Col. iii. 10) But if ‘ to be created after God,’ or ‘ in his image and likeness,’ is to be created in righteousness and holiness by which we are ‘ created unto good works,’ is a *new man, a divine nature*; it is easy to infer, that man was at first created *righteous or holy*. (p. 9, 10.)

“ II. All things, as at first made by God, were *very good*. Nor indeed could he make them otherwise. Now a *rational* being is *not good*, unless his *rational* powers are all devoted to God. The goodness of man, as a rational being, must lie in a devotedness and consecration to God. Consequently, man was at first thus devoted to God: otherwise he was *not good*. But this devotedness to the love and service of God is true righteousness or holiness. This righteousness then, this goodness, or uprightness, this regular and due state, or disposition of the human mind, was at first natural to man. It was wrought into his nature, and con-created with his rational powers. A rational creature, as such, is capable of knowing, loving, serving, living in communion with the Most Holy One. Adam at first either did or did not use this capacity; either he knew and loved God, or he did not. If he did not, he was *not very good*, no, nor *good* at all: if he did, he was upright, righteous, holy. (p. 12.)

“ III. When God vested man with dominion over the other creatures, how was he qualified for exercising that dominion, unless he had in himself a principle of love and obedience to the supreme Governor? Did not God form the creatures obedient to man, to confirm man in his loving obedience to God? Or did he create them with a disposition to depend on and obey man as their lord, and not create man with a disposition to obey and live dependent on the Lord of all? But this disposition is uprightness. •Therefore God ‘ made man upright.’ (p. 13.)

“ IV Either man was created with principles of love and obe

dience, or he was created an enemy to God. One of those must be: for as all the duty required of man, as a rational being, is summarily comprised in love, a supreme love to God, and a subordinate love to others, for his sake: so there can be no medium between a rational creature's loving God, and not loving, which is a degree of *enmity* to him. Either, O man, thou lovest God, or thou dost not: if thou dost, thou art holy or righteous: if thou dost not, thou art indisposed to serve him in such a manner, and with such a frame of spirit as he requires. Then thou art an enemy to God, a rebel against his authority. But God could not create man in such a state, in a state of enmity against himself. It follows, that man was created a lover of God, that is, righteous and holy. (p. 14.)

"In a word. Can you prove, either that man was not 'created after God, or that this does not mean being 'created in righteousness and true holiness ?' Was not man, as all creatures, good in his kind ? And is a rational creature good, unless all its powers are devoted to God ? Was not man duly qualified at first to exercise dominion over the other creatures ? And could he be so qualified without a principle of love and obedience to their common Lord ? Lastly, Can any man prove, either that man could be innocent if he did not love the Lord his God with all his heart ? Or that such a love to God is not righteousness and true holiness ? (p. 15.)

"From the doctrine of man's *Original Righteousness* we may easily conclude that of *Original Sin*. For this reason it is, that some so earnestly protest against original righteousness, because they dread looking on themselves as by nature fallen creatures and children of wrath. If man was not holy at first, he could not fall from a state of holiness: and consequently the first transgression exposed him and his posterity to nothing but temporal death. But on the other hand, if 'man was made upright,' it follows, 1. That man, when he fell, lost his original righteousness, and therewith his title to God's favour and to communion with God. 2. That he thereby incurred not only temporal but spiritual death. He became 'dead in sin and a child of wrath.' And, 3. That all his posterity are born with such a nature, not as man had at first, but as he contracted by his fall. (p. 20, 21.)

GEN. ii. 16, 17

And the LORD GOD commanded the Man, saying, Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it. For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

"GOD forbad man to eat of this tree, in token of his sovereign authority, and for the exercise of man's love, and the trial of his obedience. The words added, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' or literally, *In dying thou shalt die*, mean, not only, *Thou shalt certainly die*, but *Thou shalt suffer every kind of death*. Thy soul as well as thy body shall die. And indeed if God made man *upright* or *holy*: if man at first enjoyed 'the life of God, including

holiness joined with blessedness: and if the miserable state of the soul (as well as the dissolution of the body) is in Scripture termed *death*, it plainly follows, that the original threatening includes nothing less than a loss of man's original uprightness, of his title to God's favour, and a life of happy communion with God. (p. 26, 27.)

“ The words mean farther, *Thou shalt instantly die*; as soon as ever thou eatest. And so he did. For in that instant his original righteousness, title to God's favour, and communion with God being lost, he was spiritually dead, dead in sin, his soul was dead to God, and his body liable to death, temporal and eternal. (p. 28, 29.)

“ And as there is a threatening of death expressed in these words, so a promise of life is implied. The threatening death, only in case of disobedience, implied, that otherwise he should not die. And even since the fall, the law of God promises life to obedience, as well as threatens death to disobedience: since the tenor of it is, ‘ Do this and live:’ ‘ If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. (p. 30.)

“ Now a law given by God with a promise of life and a threatening of death, consented to by man, is evidently a covenant. For what is a covenant? But a mutual agreement of two or more parties on certain terms? Now in this sense God covenanted with man, and man covenanted with God. God gave a law, promising life in case of obedience, and threatening death in case of disobedience. And man accepted of the terms. Here therefore was a real covenant. (p. 31.)

“ But to guard this against objections, I add,

“ 1. We do not affirm, that God visibly appeared, and formally treated with Adam, as one man with another. Without so formal a procedure, God could and doubtless did, signify to him, on what terms he was to expect life or death. (p. 32.)

“ We do not assert, that God promised to translate him to heaven: but without question he made Adam sensible, that if he continued obedient he should continue happy, whether in Paradise or some other region.

“ 3. If one greatly superior will freely condescend to treat with an inferior, this does not disannul the mutual agreement, or hinder its having the nature of a covenant. So God entered into a proper covenant with Abraham of old, and with his people in the gospel. And if so, much more might he do so with man, when perfectly upright toward God. (p. 33.)

“ And this covenant was made with Adam not only for himself, but likewise for all his posterity. This appears,

“ 1. From the tenor of the original threatening, compared with the present state of mankind. For it is evident, that every one of his posterity is born liable to death: that the death to which all are liable, was not threatened but in case of man's sinning: that man was not liable to death till he sinned, and his being so was the result of the threatening; and, that the Scripture constantly points at sin as the sole cause of death, and of all suffering. But if all mankind are born liable to that which was originally threatened only to sin, then

all mankind are accounted sinners, and as such are concerned in the original threatening, and consequently in the original promise. (p. 34.)

“2. From 1 Cor. xv. 22. ‘In Adam all die.’ Here the Apostle speaks not of both our parents, but of Adam singly, (as also Rom v.) to denote our peculiar relation to him. The *all* mentioned are all his natural descendants, who all die in or through him, that is, are liable to death on account of their relation to him. And it is not only a bodily death that is here spoken of; for it stands opposed not to a bare revival of the body, but to a happy and glorious resurrection, such as *they that are Christ's* will partake of at his second coming. For of this resurrection, not that of the ungodly, the Apostle is speaking throughout this chapter. But they could not *die in Adam*, if they did not in some sense *sin in him*, and fall *with him*: if the covenant had not been made with him, not for himself only but for all his posterity. (p. 35, 36.)

“3. From verse 45 and 47 of the same chapter. The *first Man*, Adam, and the *second Man*, the *last Adam*, are here opposed. Now why is Christ, notwithstanding the millions of men intervening between Adam and him, and following after his birth, called *the second Man*, and *the last Adam*? We have an answer. Rom. v. 12, 14, &c. where Adam is said to be *a figure of Christ*: and the resemblance between them is shown to lie in this, that as sin and death descend from one, so righteousness and life from the other. Consequently what Christ is with regard to all his spiritual seed, that Adam is with regard to all his natural descendants, namely, a *public person*, a *federal head*, a *legal representative*: one with whom the covenant was made not only for himself, but also for his whole posterity.”

JOHN iii. 5, 6.

Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

That which is born of the flesh, is flesh: and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.

IN this text we have,

- I. The New-Birth described :
- II. The Necessity of it insisted on.
- III. The original Corruption of every child of Adam observed, as that from which the necessity of such a change arises.

· 1. The new-birth is here described. Whatever this implies, the Spirit of God is the sole author of it. He does not help a man to regenerate himself, but takes the work into his own hands. A child of God, as such, is *not born of blood*; does not become so by a descent from pious parents. He is not *born of the will of the flesh*, is not renewed by the power of his own carnal will; *nor of man*, of any man whatsoever, *but of God*: by the sole power of his Spirit.

“In regeneration the Holy Spirit mortifies the old man, corrupts nature, and breathes a principle of life into the soul: a principle of

faith, of sincere love, and willing obedience to God. He who was *dead in sin*, is now *dead to sin*, and alive to God through Jesus Christ.' God has created in him a clean heart,' and renewed a right spirit within him.' He has 'created him unto good works,' and 'written his law in his heart.' But if the Spirit of God is the sole agent in the work of regeneration; if the soul of man has no active interest or concern in his being 'born again'; if man was created holy, and regeneration reinstamps that holy image of God on the soul: if 'the new man is created after God in righteousness and true holiness: if the corruption of nature (termed 'the old man or flesh') is not contracted by imitation or custom, but is an inbred, hereditary distemper, coeval with our nature: if all truly good works are the fruits of a good heart, a good principle wrought in the soul: it plainly follows, that the faith, hope, love, fear, which distinguish the children of God from others, are not of the nature of *acquired*, but of *infused habits* or principles. To say then, 'That all holiness must be the effect of a man's own choice and endeavour, and that by a right use of his natural powers every man may and must attain a habit of holiness, that is, *be born again*:' however pleasing it may be to human vanity, is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture.

" And all the scriptural expressions on this head are grounded on the real nature of things. Sin is of the nature of filth and corruption. It pollutes the whole man, and renders him as an unclean thing in the sight of God. When therefore the Spirit of God removes this, he is said to 'create a clean heart,' to 'purify the heart, to sprinkle clean water upon us,' to 'wash us from our filthiness.' And this cleansing efficacy is in the text expressed by being 'born of water and of the Spirit.'

" When therefore our Lord speaks of being born of the Spirit, his plain meaning is, there is a spiritual cleansing you must partake of, mentioned in these promises, I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. And I will take away the stony heart, and I will give you a heart of flesh.' These promises give us a plain description of the Spirit's regenerating work: without experiencing which, our state is miserable now, and will be much more so hereafter.

" II. For this spiritual renovation of the soul is indispensably necessary. Without it none can 'enter into the kingdom of heaven, either the kingdom of grace or of glory.'

" 1. Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom' of grace; he cannot be a loyal subject of Jesus Christ. By nature we are subjects of Satan: and such we must remain, unless renewing grace 'translate us into the kingdom of God's dear Son.'

" 2. Consequently 'except we are born again, we cannot enter into the kingdom' of glory. Indeed, supposing he could be admitted there, what could an unregenerate sinner do in heaven? He could

not possibly have any relish either for the business, the company, or the enjoyments of that world.

“ III. Our Lord having asserted the absolute necessity of the New Birth, to show the ground of this necessity, adds, ‘That which is born of the flesh, is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.’ Here observe,

“ 1. Our Lord opposes *flesh* and *spirit* to each other, which opposition we often meet with. Whatever therefore is meant by these two, they denote things opposite.

“ 2. He speaks here of two several births, which are distinctly mentioned.

“ The former of these two is spoken of as that which renders the other so necessary. Because ‘that which is born of the flesh, is flesh,’ therefore ‘we must be born of the Spirit.’ Therefore this great change must be wrought in us, or we cannot ‘enter into the kingdom of God.’

“ 4. If the latter of these is made necessary by the former, then to be *born flesh* is to be born corrupt and sinful. And indeed the word *flesh* is very frequently taken for the corrupt principle in man. It is always so taken when it stands opposed to *the spirit*, or to that inwrought principle of obedience, which itself also (taking the name of its author) is sometimes termed *spirit*.

“ Now in the text, whatever or whoever is born of a man since the fall, is denominated *flesh*. And that *flesh* is here put, not for sinless *frailty*, but sinful corruption, we learn from its being opposed to the *spirit*. Christ was born *frail*, as well as we, and in this sense was *flesh*: yet being without sin he had no need to be ‘born of the Spirit.’ This is not made necessary by any sinless infirmities, but by a sinful nature only. This alone is opposite to *the spirit*: thus therefore we must understand it here.

“ But Dr. Taylor says, ‘To be born of the flesh is only to be naturally born of a woman.’ I answer, Is not *flesh* opposed to *spirit* in this verse ? Is it not the Spirit of God which is spoken of in the latter clause, together with the principle of grace, which is in every degenerate person ? And is any thing beside sinful corruption opposite to the Spirit of God ? No certainly: but if so, and if wherever *flesh* is opposed to *the Spirit*, it implies sinful corruption, then it is evident to be ‘born of the flesh’ is to be the sinful offspring of sinful parents, so as to have need of the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit, on that account even from our birth.

“ If to ‘walk after the flesh,’ as opposed to ‘walking after the Spirit,’ is to follow our sinful inclinations ; if to ‘be in the flesh’ opposed to ‘being in the Spirit,’ is to be in a state of sin ; if ‘the flesh’ and ‘the Spirit’ are two contrary principles, which counteract each other. (Gal. v. 16, 17.) If ‘the works of the flesh’ and ‘the lusts of the flesh’ are opposed to ‘the Spirit,’ and ‘the fruit of the Spirit :’ then ‘to be born of the flesh’ must signify more than barely to be born of a woman. Had Adam transmitted a pure nature to his descendants, still each of them would have been born of a woman :

but they would have had no necessity of ‘being born of the Spirit,’ or renewed by the Holy Ghost

“ But what is that corruption of nature which the Scripture terms *flesh*? There are two branches of it; 1. A want of original righteousness. 2. A natural propensity to sin.

“ 1. A want of original righteousness. God created man righteous; holiness was con-natural to his soul; a principle of love and obedience to God. But when he sinned he lost this principle. And every man is now born totally void both of the knowledge and love of God.

“ 2. A natural propensity to sin is in every man. And this is inseparable from the other. If man is born and grows up without the knowledge or love of God, he is born and grows up propense to sin: which includes two things, an aversion to what is good, and an inclination to what is evil.

“ We are naturally averse to what is good. ‘The carnal mind is enmity against God.’ Nature does not, will not, cannot submit to his holy, just, and good law. Therefore ‘they that are in the flesh cannot please God.’ Being averse to the will, law, and ways of God, they are utterly indisposed for such an obedience, as the relation between God and man indispensably requires.

“ And as we are all naturally averse to what is good, so we are naturally inclined to what is evil. Even young children of themselves run into evil; but are with difficulty brought to practise what is good. No sooner do they discover reason, than they discover evil, unreasonable dispositions. And these discovering themselves in every one, even from his early childhood, manifestly prove the inbred and universal corruption of human nature.

“ But why is this corruption termed *flesh*? Not because it is confined to the body. It is the corruption of our whole nature, and is therefore termed *the old man*. Not because it consists merely in a repugnance of the sensual appetites to reason. This is but one branch of that corruption; the whole of it is far more extensive. Not because it is primarily seated in the body; it is primarily seated in the soul. If ‘sin reigns in our mortal bodies,’ it is because the sinful soul uses the bodily members as ‘instruments of unrighteousness.’

“ Nay, all which those words, ‘That which is born of flesh is flesh,’ mean, is this, all men being descended of frail and mortal parents, are like them, *frail* and *mortal*. In consequence of Adam’s sin all his descendants die.”

“ I answer, 1. Though this is true, it is not the whole truth. No, is it the proper truth of the text: which speaks of our being ‘born of the flesh,’ as the reason why we must be born of the Spirit.

“ 2. It is not consistent with the moral perfections of God, for sinless creatures to be born mortal. Death in every sense of the word is *the proper wages of sin*. Sin has the same casual influence on death, as the obedience of Christ has on eternal life.

“ 3. We were not only born mortal, but ‘children of wrath’ we who are now regenerate as well as others.

“ 4. The Scripture ascribes both our mortality and corruption to our relation to Adam. ‘In him all die ; through the offence of one, many,’ all mankind, ‘are dead,’ liable to death. Again : ‘By the disobedience of one,’ the same, ‘many are constituted sinners.’ Therefore when our Lord says, ‘That which is born of the flesh is flesh,’ he means not only, that we and our parents are mortal : but that all mankind derive *spiritual* as well as temporal *death*, from their first father.



THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE.

Of Imputed Sin and Righteousness.

“ 1. ‘Sin is a transgression of the law,’ of that law of God to which a rational creature is subject. *Righteousness* is, a fulfilment of, or conformity to that law. This is the proper scriptural sense of the words. But as sin involves the creature in *guilt*, that is a liability to punishment, the same words are often used, to denote either sin itself, or *guilt* and *punishment*. On the other hand, *righteousness* denotes not only a fulfilling of the law, but also a *freedom from guilt*, and *punishment*. Yea, and sometimes all the *rewards of righteousness*. (p. 1, 2.)

“ Accordingly, to *impute sin*, is either to impute *sin itself*, or *guilt* on the account of it. To impute *sin itself* to a person, is to account him a transgressor of the law: to pronounce him such: or to treat him as a transgressor. To *impute guilt* to a person, is to account him obnoxious to a threatened punishment: to pronounce him so; or to inflict that punishment. So, to *impute righteousness*, properly so called, is to account him a fulfiller of the law: to pronounce him so to be: and to *treat* him as righteous. And to *impute righteousness* as opposed to guilt, is to account, to pronounce, and to treat him as guiltless. (p. 5.)

“ Thus much is agreed. But the point in question is, “Does God impute no *sin* or *righteousness* but what is personal?” Dr. Taylor positively asserts, he does not. I undertake to prove, that he does: that he imputes Adam’s first sin to all mankind, and our sins to Christ. (p. 5.)

“ I. God imputes Adam’s *first sin* to all mankind. I do not mean that the *actual commission* of it was imputed to any beside himself: (it was impossible it should.) Nor is the guilt of it imputed to any of his descendants, in the full latitude of it, or in regard to its attendant circumstances. It constitutes none of them equally guilty with him. Yet both that sin itself, and a degree of guilt on account of it, are imputed to all his posterity: the sin itself is imputed to them, as included in their head. And on this account, they are reputed guilty, are ‘children of wrath,’ liable to the threatened punishment

And this cannot be denied, supposing, 1. Man's original righteousness. 2. Adam's being the federal head of all mankind. (p. 6.)

“Man's original righteousness has been largely proved. Let me add only an argument *ad hominem*. Supposing (not granting) that the Son of God, is no more than the first of creatures, either he was *originally righteous*, or he was not. If he was not, then time was, when he was not ‘The Holy One of God;’ and possibly he never might have been such, no, nor *righteous at all*: but instead of that, as *ungodly, guilty, and wretched* as the Devil himself is. For the best creature is (Dr. Taylor grants) alterable for the worse, and the best when corrupted becomes the worst. Again, if the Son of God was a mere creature, and as such made without righteousness (which every creature must be according to Dr Taylor) then he was not, could not be at first as righteous, as like God as the holy angels are now, yea, as any holy man on earth is. But if these suppositions are shockingly absurd, if the Son of God could not have become as bad as the Devil, if he never was unrighteous, if he was not originally less holy, than angels and men are now: then the assertion, “That righteousness must be the effect of a creature's antecedent choice and endeavour,” falls to the ground. (p. 7. 9.)

“But the Hebrew word *Jasher*, Dr. Taylor says “does not generally signify a moral character.” This is one of the numerous critical mistakes in this gentleman's books. Of the more than 150 texts in which *Jasher*, or the substantive *Josher* occurs, there are very few which do not confirm our interpretation of Eccles. vii. 29. “But *Jasher* is applied to various things not capable of moral action.” It is, and what then? Many of these applications are neither for us nor against us. Some make strongly for us; as when it is applied to the words or ways of God and man. But the question now is, what it signifies, when applied to God or to moral agents, and that by way of opposition to a vicious character and conduct? Is it not in the text before us, applied to man as a moral agent, and by way of opposition to a corrupt character and conduct? No man can deny it. Either, therefore, prove, That *Jasher*, when opposed, as here, to a corrupt conduct and character, does not signify righteous, or acknowledge the truth, that God ‘created man upright or righteous.’ (p. 11.)

“To evade the argument from Eph. iv. 24, Dr. Taylor first says, ‘The old man means an heathenish life,’ and then says, “The old and new man do not signify a course of life.” What then do they signify? Why, “The old man,” says he, “relates to the Gentile state: and the new man is either the Christian state, or the Christian church, body, society.” But, for all this, he says again a page or two after, “The old and new man, and the new man's being renewed, and the renewing of the Ephesians do all manifestly refer to their Gentile state and wicked course of life, from which they were lately converted.” (p. 13.)

“When then the Apostle says, (Rom. vi. 6.) ‘Our old man is crucified with Christ,’ is it the *Gentile state or course of life* which was so crucified? No: but the ‘corrupt nature,’ ‘the body of sin,’ as it is

termed in the same verse. And 'to put off the old man' is (according to St. Paul) 'to crucify this with its affections and desires.' On the other hand, 'To put on the new man is to cultivate the divine principle, which is formed in the soul of every believer, by the Spirit of Christ.' It is this of which it is said, 1. It is *created*; and in regard to it we are said to be 'created unto good works.' 2. It is renewed; for it is indeed no other than original righteousness restored. 3. It is after God, after his image and likeness, now stamped afresh on the soul. 4. It consists in righteousness and holiness, or that *knowledge* which comprehends both. (p. 14.)

"Again, to that argument, "Either man at first loved God, or he was an enemy to God," Dr. Taylor gives only this slight superficial answer, "Man could not love God before he knew him :" without vouchsafing the least notice of the arguments which prove, that man was not created without the knowledge of God. Let him attend to those proofs, and either honestly yield to their force, or if he is able, fairly confute them.

"The doctrine of original sin pre-supposes,

"2. Adam's being the federal head of all mankind. Several proofs of this having been given already, I need not produce more till those are answered.

"II. God imputes our sins or the guilt of them to Christ. He consented to be responsible for them, to suffer the punishment due for them. This sufficiently appears from Isa. liii. which contains a summary of the scripture doctrine upon this head. 'He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.' The word *Nasa* (*borne*) signifies, 1. To *take up* somewhat, as on one's shoulders; 2. To *bear* or *carry* something weighty, as a porter does a burden; 3. To *take away*: and in all these senses it is here applied to the Son of God: he *carried*, as a strong man does a heavy burden (the clear, indisputable sense of the other word, *Sabal*) *our sorrows*; the sufferings of various kinds, which were due to our sins. 'He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.' *Wounds and bruises* are put for the whole of his sufferings; as his death and blood frequently are. He was *wounded and bruised*, not for sins of his own; not merely to show God's hatred of sin; not chiefly, to give us a pattern of patience: but for our sins, as the proper, impulsive cause. Our sins were the procuring cause of all his sufferings. His sufferings were the penal effects of our sins. 'The chastisement of our peace,' the punishment necessary to procure it, was laid on him, freely submitting thereto: 'and by his stripes,' (a part of his sufferings again put for the whole,) 'we are healed': pardon, sanctification, and final salvation, are all purchased and bestowed upon us. Every *chastisement* is for some fault. That laid on Christ was not for his own, but ours; and was needful to reconcile an offended Lawgiver, and offending guilty creatures to each other. So 'the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all,' that is, the punishment due to our iniquity. (p. 17—20.)

"It is true, as Dr. Taylor says, "Sin and iniquity often signify

fliction or suffering." But why? Because it is usual for a *cause* to give denomination to its *effect*. And so the consequences of sin are called by the same name. But this rather hurts Dr. Taylor's cause than helps it. For *sufferings* could with no propriety be called *sin*, if they were not the proper effects of it. Man in innocence was liable to no suffering or sorrow; he was indeed tried; but not by suffering. All sorrow was introduced by sin; and if man is 'born to trouble,' it is because he is born *in sin*. God indeed does afflict his children for their good; and turns even death into a blessing. Yet as it is the effect of sin, so is it in itself an enemy to all mankind nor would any man have been either tried or corrected by affliction, had it not been for sin. (p. 21, 22.)

"The Lord's laying on Christ the iniquity of us all" was eminently typified by the high-priest, 'putting all the iniquities of Israel or the scape-goat,' who then *carried them away*. "But the goat," says Dr. Taylor, "was to suffer nothing." This is a gross mistake. It was a *sin-offering*, (ver. 5,) and as such was to 'bear upon him all the iniquities' of the people into the wilderness, and there (as the Jewish doctors unanimously hold,) to suffer a violent death, by way of *punishment*, instead of the people, for their sins *put upon him*. Yet Dr Taylor says, "Here was no imputation of sin." No! What is the difference between *imputing sins*, and *putting them upon him*? This is just of a piece with "A sin-offering that suffered nothing." A creature "turned loose into a land the properest for its subsistence," while 'bearing upon him all the iniquities of God's people!' (p. 23—25.)

"Thus Christ 'redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' Dr. Taylor when he wrote his late books, was not apprised of the usual scripture-meaning of this awful word *curse*. It is often put to signify, the *legal punishment of sin*. What the law of God threatens against transgressors, or the threatening itself, is frequently called by this name. What signifies then his trifling observation, "That God inflicted no curse on our first parents, Gen. iii. 16, 18." That is, he did not say in so many words, "Cursed art thou, O man, or, O woman." But God's cursing the ground for man's sake, was really a *curse* pronounced against him; and what the Lord said to the woman was really a *curse*, a penalty legally inflicted on her. For God is then said to *curse*, when he either threatens to punish, or actually punishes his creatures for sin. See Deut. xxvii. 15, &c. chap. xxviii. 16, &c. Jer. xvii. 5. Zech. v. 3. (p. 39, 40.)

"To conclude. Either we must allow the *imputation* of Adam's sin, whatever difficulties attend it, or renounce justification by Christ, and salvation through the merit of his blood. Accordingly the *Seminarians* do this. Whether Dr. Taylor does, let every thinking man judge, after having weighed what he writes, particularly at p. 72, 73. of his *Scripture-Doctrine*. "The worthiness of Christ is his *summate virtue*. It is virtue that carrieth every cause in heaven. Virtue is the only price which purchaseth every thing with God."

'True virtue, or the right exercise of reason, is true worth, and the only valuable consideration, the only power which prevails with God.' These passages are indeed connected with others, which carry with them a show of ascribing honour to Christ and grace. But the fallacy lies open to every careful, intelligent, unprejudiced reader. He ascribes to Christ a singular *worthiness*; but it is nothing more than a superior degree, of the same kind of worthiness which belongs to every *virtuous* man. He talks of Christ's consummate *virtue*, or his obedience to God, and good-will to man. And to this virtue of his, as imitated by us, he would teach us to ascribe our acceptance with God: which is, indeed, to ascribe it to ourselves, or to our own virtue; to *works of righteousness done by us*, in direct opposition to the whole tenor of the gospel. To what dangerous lengths are men carried by an *ignorance* of God, as infinitely holy and just; by a fond conceit of their own abilities, and a resolved opposition to the doctrine of original sin! Rather than allow this, they renounce Christ, as the *meritorious procurer* of salvation for sinners. They may *seem* indeed to acknowledge him as such, and talk of "Eternal life as given by God through his Son." But all this is mere show, and can only impose on the ignorant and unwary. They dare not profess in plain terms, that Christ has *merited salvation for any*: neither can they consistently allow this, while they deny original sin. (p. 80, 81.)

"Let not any then who regard their everlasting interests entertain or even tamper with doctrines, which how plausibly soever recommended, are contrary to many express texts, nay, to the whole tenor of Scripture, and which cannot be embraced without renouncing an humble dependance on Christ, and rejecting the gospel-method of salvation. (p. 82.)

"God grant every reader of this plain treatise may not only be convinced of the truth and importance of the scripture-doctrines maintained therein, but invincibly confirmed in his attachments to them, by an experimental knowledge of their happy influence on faith, holiness, and comfort! Then shall we gladly say, We, who are made sinners by the disobedience of Adam, are made righteous by the obedience of Christ. His righteousness entitles us to a far better inheritance than that we lost in Adam. In consequence of being justified through him, we shall *reign in life* with him: unto whom, with God the Father, and the sanctifying, comforting Spirit, as ascribed all praise for ever!" (p. 83.)

PART VI.

The Doctrine of Original Sin explained and vindicated.

“ The phrase, Original Sin, so far as we can discover, was first used in the fourth century. The first who used it was either St. Chrysostom, or Hilary, some of whose words are these: ‘ The Psalmist says, ‘ Behold I was conceived in iniquities, in sins did my mother conceive me.’ He acknowledges, that he was born under *original sin*, and the law of sin.’ ” Soon after Hilary’s time, St. Augustine and other Christian writers brought it into common use. (p. 2, 3.)

“ The scriptural doctrine of original sin may be comprised in the following propositions :

- “ I. Man was originally made righteous or holy :
- “ II. That original righteousness was lost by the first sin :
- “ III. Thereby man incurred death of every kind : for,
- “ IV Adam’s first sin was the sin of a *public person*, one whom God had appointed to represent all his descendants :
- “ V Hence all these are from their birth *children of wrath*, void of all righteousness, and propense to sin of all sorts.

“ I add, VI. This is not only a truth agreeable to Scripture and reason, but a truth of the utmost importance, and one to which the churches of Christ from the beginning, have bore a clear testimony

“ I. Man was originally made righteous or holy : formed with such a principle of love and obedience to his Maker, as disposed and enabled him to perform the whole of his duty with ease and pleasure. This has been proved already. And this wholly overturns Dr. Taylor’s fundamental aphorism, “ Whatever is natural is necessary, and what is necessary is not sinful.” For if man was originally righteous or holy, we may argue thus. It was at first *natural* to man to love and obey his Maker : yet it was not *necessary* : neither as *necessary* is opposed to *voluntary* or *free* ; (for he both loved and obeyed *freely* and *willingly*) nor, as *necessary* means *unavoidable* ; (this is manifest by the event;) no, nor as *necessary* is opposed to *rewardable*. For had he continued to love and obey, he would have been rewarded with everlasting happiness. Therefore that assertion “whatever is *natural* is *necessary*,” is palpably, glaringly false. Consequently, what is natural as well as what is acquired, may be good or evil, rewardable or punishable. (p. 10.)

“ II. Man’s original righteousness was lost by the first sin. Though he was made righteous, he was not made immutable. He was free to stand or fall. And he soon fell, and lost at once both the favour and image of God. This fully appears, 1. From the ac-

count which Moses gives of our first parents, Gen. iii. where we read, (1.) 'The eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked ;' that is, they were conscious of guilt, and touched with a pungent sense of their folly and wickedness. They began to find their nakedness irksome to them, and to reflect on it with sinful emotions of soul. (2.) Immediately they were indisposed for communion with God, and struck with such a dread of him as could not consist with true love, ver. 8. (3.) When questioned by God, how do they prevaricate, instead of confessing their sin, and humbly imploring forgiveness ? Which proves, not only their having sinned, but their being as yet wholly impenitent. (4.) The judgment passed upon them was a proof of their being guilty in the sight of God. Thus was man's original righteousness lost. Thus did he fall both from the favour and image of God. (p. 14, 15.)

"This appears, 2. From the guilt which inseparably attends every transgression of the divine law. I say, every transgression ; because every sin virtually contains all sin. For 'whosoever keepeth the whole law and offendeth in one point, he is guilty of all.' Every single offence is a virtual breach of all the commands of God. There is in every particular sin, the principle of *all* sin ; namely, the contempt of that sovereign authority, which is equally stamped upon every command. When, therefore, our first parents ate the forbidden fruit, they not only violated a particular precept, but the entire law of God. They could not sin in one instance, without virtually transgressing the whole law of their creation : which being once done, their title to God's favour and their original righteousness were both lost. (p. 16.)

"This appears, 3. From the comprehensive nature and aggravating circumstances of the first transgression. For it implied, (1.) *Unbelief*. Man did not dare to break the divine command till he was brought to question the truth of the divine threatening. (2.) *Irreverence of God*. Reverence is a mixture of love and fear. And had they continued in their first love and filial fear, they could not have broken through the sole command of God. (3.) *Ingratitude*. For what a return did they hereby make to their Creator for all his benefits ! (4.) *Pride and ambition*. Affecting to be 'as gods, knowing good and evil.' (5.) *Sensuality*. The woman looked upon the fruit with an irregular appetite. Here the conflict between *reason* and *sense* began. To talk of such a conflict in man before he fell, is to represent him as in a degree sinful and guilty, even while innocent. For *Conflict* implies *opposition*. And an opposition of *appetite* to *reason* is nothing else than a repugnance to the law of God. But of this our first parents were no way guilty, till their innocence was impaired, till they were led by the temptation of the Devil to desire the forbidden fruit. (6.) *Robbery* ; for the fruit was none of theirs. They had no manner of right to it. Therefore their taking it was a flat robbery of God, which cannot be less criminal than robbing our fellow-creatures. So comprehensive was

the nature, so aggravated the circumstances of man's first transgression. (p. 17, 18.)

“ III. Hereby he incurred death of every kind ; not only temporal, but also *spiritual* and *eternal*. By losing his original righteousness, he became not only mortal as to his body, but also spiritually dead, ‘dead to God,’ ‘dead in sin :’ void of that principle which St. Paul terms ‘the life of God,’ Eph. iv. 18 : St. John, ‘Eternal life abiding in us.’ 1 John iii. 15. A creature formed with a capacity of knowing, loving, and serving God, must be either ‘dead in sin,’ or ‘alive to God.’ Adam, in his primitive state, was ‘alive to God ;’ but after he had sinned, dead in sin, as well as dead in law. (p. 20.)

“ But Dr. Taylor is sure only temporal death was to be the consequence of his disobedience. ‘For death is the loss of life, and must be understood according to the nature of the life to which it is opposed.’ Most true : and the life to which it is here opposed, the life Adam enjoyed till lost by sin, was not only *bodily life*, but the principle of holiness which the Scripture terms ‘the life of God.’ It was also a title to eternal life. All this, therefore, he lost by sin. And that justly : for ‘death is the’ due ‘wages of sin ;’ death, both temporal, spiritual, and eternal. (p. 21.)

“ IV. Adam's first sin was the sin of a public person, one whom God had appointed to represent all his descendants. This also has been proved. In one sense, indeed, Adam's sin *was not ours*. It was not our personal fault, our actual transgression. But in another sense it *was ours*. It was the sin of our common representative. And as such, St. Paul shows it is imputed to us and all his descendants. Hence, (p. 25.)

“ V. All these are from their birth ‘children of wrath,’ void of all righteousness, and propense to sin of all sorts.

“ In order to clear and confirm this proposition, I intend,

“ 1. To consider a text which proves Original Sin in the full extent of it : (p. 26.)

“ 2. To explain some other texts which relate either to the *guilt* or *corruption* we derive from our first parents :

“ 3. To add some arguments which Dr. Taylor has taken no notice of, or touched but very slightly :

“ 4. To answer objections.

“ And, 1 To consider that text, Eph. ii. 3, ‘And were by nature children of wrath, even as others.’ In the beginning of the chapter, St. Paul puts the Ephesians in mind of what God had done for them. This led him to observe, what they had been before their conversion to God. They had been ‘dead in trespasses and sins, but were now ‘quickened,’ made alive to God. They had ‘walked according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that worketh with energy in the children of disobedience. Among such,’ saith the apostle, ‘we all had our conversation in times past,’ the whole time before our conversion, ‘fulfilling the desires of the flesh.’

and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as others.' (p. 27.) On this I observe,

“1. The persons spoken of are both the believing Ephesians and the apostle himself. For he says not, *ye were*, speaking in the second person, as he had done, ver. 1, 2, but *we were*, plainly with a design the more expressly to include himself. Indeed had he still spoken in the second person, yet what is here affirmed would have been true of *him* as well as *them*. But for the sake of more explicitly including himself, he chose to say, *we were*: you, Ephesians, who were descended of heathen parents, and *I*, who was born in the visible church.

“2. The *wrath* here spoken of means either God’s displeasure at sinners, or the punishment, which he threatens and inflicts for sin. (p. 28.)

“3. ‘Children of wrath’ is a Hebraism, and denotes persons worthy of, or liable to wrath. And this implies the being sinners; seeing sin only exposes us to God’s displeasure, and the dreadful effects of it.

“4. This charge the apostle fixes on himself and them, as they had been before their conversion. He does not say, we are, but ‘we were children of wrath.’ (p. 29.)

“5. He speaks of himself and the converted Ephesians, as having been so *equally with others*. There is an emphasis on the words, *even as others*: even as the stubborn Jews, and idolatrous Heathens: even as all who are still ‘strangers and enemies to Christ.’ These are still ‘children of wrath.’ But whatever difference there is between us and them, *we were* once what *they are* now.

“6. He expressly says, ‘we were children of wrath, even as others, by nature,’ or from our birth. He does not say, we became so by *education*, or by *imitation*, or by *custom* in sinning. But to show us when it is that we commence sinners, by what means we become ‘children of wrath,’ whence it is that we are *so prone to evil from our infancy*, and to imitate bad rather than good examples, he says, ‘we were children of wrath by nature,’ we were born fallen creatures. We came into the world sinners, and as such *liable to wrath*, in consequence of the fall of our first father.

“But it is affirmed, 1. That “*by nature* means *by habit* or *custom*.” I answer, though the term *nature*, with some qualifying expression annexed, is sometimes taken for inveterate custom, yet it is never so taken when put singly without any such qualifying expression. When, therefore, the Apostle says absolutely, ‘we were children of wrath by nature,’ this, according to the constant sense of the words, must mean, we were so from our birth. (p. 31.)

“It is affirmed, 2. That “because the original words stands thus, *τεκνα φύσει οργης*, *children by nature of wrath*: therefore children by nature means only *truly and really* children of wrath.” I answer, The consequence is good for nothing: for let the words stand how they will, it is evident, that *τεκνα φύσει*, are *children by birth*, or such as are born so, in distinction from those who become such afterward.

“ It is affirmed, 3. “ That *φύσις*, *by nature*, signifies no more than *truly* or *really*.” I answer, (1.) It is not allowed, that any good Greek writers ever use the word in this sense. (2.) Whatever others do, the writers of the New Testament, always use it in another sense. So Gal. ii. 15, ‘ We who are Jews by nature,’ *φύσις Ἰudeiοις*. That is, *We who are born Jews*, in contradistinction to Proselytes, Gal. iv. 8, ‘ Ye did service to them which by nature are no gods ;’ *μη φύσει θεοίς*, persons or things which are partakers of no *divine nature*. Rom. ii. 14, ‘ The Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law ;’ that is, by their own natural powers, without a written law. Neither here nor any where else does the word *φύσις* signify no more than *really* or *truly*. (p. 32.)

“ It remains then, that the word which we render *by nature*, does really so signify.

“ And yet it is allowed, we are not so guilty *by nature*, as a course of actual sin afterward makes us. But we are antecedent to that course *children of wrath*, liable to some degree of wrath and punishment. Here then from a plain text, taken in its obvious sense, we have a clear evidence, both of what divines term *original sin imputed*, and of *original sin inherent*. The former is, the sin of Adam so far reckoned *ours*, as to constitute us in some degree guilty : the latter, a want of original righteousness, and corruption of nature ; whence it is, that from our infancy we are averse to what is good, and propense to what is evil. (p. 33.)

“ I am, 2. To explain some other texts which relate either to the *guilt* or the *corruption* which we derive from our first parents.

“ Gen. v. 3. Here *the image of Adam* in which *he begat a son* after his fall, stands opposed to *the image of God*, in which man was at first created. Moses had said, ver. 1, ‘ In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him.’ In this, speaking of Adam, as he was after the fall, he does not say, he begat a son in the *likeness of God* ; but he ‘ begat a son in his own *likeness* after his *image*.’ Now this must refer to Adam, either as a man ; or as a good man ; or as a mortal, sinful man. But it could not refer to him merely as a man. The inspired writer could not design to inform us, that Adam begat a man, not a lion, or a horse. It could not well refer to him as a good man. For it is not said, Adam begat a son, who at length became pious like himself ; but he begat a son in his own likeness. It refers to him therefore as a mortal, sinful man ; giving us to know, that the mortality and corruption, contracted by the fall, descended from Adam to his son : Adam a sinner, begat a sinner like himself. And if Seth was thus a sinner *by nature*, so is every other descendant of Adam. (p. 35, 36.)

“ Dr. Taylor takes no notice of the antithesis between the *likeness of God*, ver. 1, and the *likeness of Adam*, ver. 3. On the other hand, he speaks of these two as one : as if Seth had been born in the very same image of God, wherein Adam was made. But this cannot be admitted : because Adam had now lost his origi-

nal righteousness. It must, therefore, be the likeness of fallen, corrupted Adam which is here intended.

“Gen. vi. 5, “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” Here Moses having observed, as the cause of the flood, that ‘God saw that the wickedness of man was great,’ to account for this general wickedness, adds, ‘Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was evil,’ yea, was ‘only evil,’ and that ‘continually.’ The heart of man is here put for his soul. This God had formed with a marvellous thinking power. But so is his soul debased that every *imagination*, figment, formation of the thoughts of it, is *evil*, only evil, continually evil. Whatever it forms within itself, as a thinking power, is an evil formation. This Moses spoke of the Antediluvians ; but we cannot confine it to them. If all their actual wickedness sprung from the evil formations of their corrupt heart : and if consequently they were sinners from the birth, so are all others likewise. (p. 37.)

“Gen. viii. 21, ‘I will not again curse the ground any more for man’s sake ; for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth ; neither will I again smite any more every living thing.’ I will not be provoked to this by the wickedness of mankind ; for they are inclined to sin from their childhood. Was I therefore to do this as often as they deserve, I must be continually destroying the earth. The word *רֵעַ*, *imagination*, (as was observed before) includes the thoughts, affections, inclinations, with every thing which the soul, as a thinking being, forges and frames within itself. And the word we render *youth*, includes childhood and infancy, the earliest age of man ; the whole time from his birth ; (or as others affirm) from his formation in the womb.

“Indeed Dr. Taylor would translate the texts, *Although the imagination of man’s heart should be evil from his youth.* But, 1. Though the particle *כִּי* sometimes signifies *although*, yet *for* is its common meaning. And we are not to recede from the usual signification of a word without any necessity. 2. If we read *although*, it will not at all invalidate our proof. For still the plain meaning of the words would be, I will not send another general flood, although every figment or formation of the heart of every man is evil from his earliest infancy.

“Job v. 6, 7, ‘Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, yet man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards.’ The word which is here rendered *affliction*, sometimes signifies *iniquity*. For what reason but to show that these two, *sin* and *affliction*, are inseparable ? Sin is the cause of affliction, and affliction, of whatever kind, is the genuine effect of sin. Indeed it is incompatible with the justice and mercy of God, to appoint afflictions of any kind for the innocent. If Christ suffered, it was because the sins of others were imputed to him. If then every one of the posterity of Adam ‘is born to trouble,’ it must be, because he is born a sinner, for man was not originally made to suffer. Nor while he preserved his in-

nocence was he liable to suffering of any kind. Are the angels, or any pure, sinless creatures liable to any sorrow or affliction ? Surely not. But every child of Adam is. And it is in consequence of his sin, that the present life of man is short and afflictive : of which the very Heathens are deeply sensible. They also saw, that ‘great travail is created for every man, and a heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam, from the day that they go out of their mother’s womb, till the day they return to the mother of all things.’ (p. 40.)

“ Job xi. 12, ‘Vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass’s colt ;’ in the original, *though man be born* (will be born in every age) *the colt of a wild ass.* Dr. Taylor owns, ‘We are born quite ignorant.’ But this is far from reaching the plain import of the text, in which man, as born into the world, is compared to an animal most remarkably stupid and intractable. And such all the sons of Adam naturally are, particularly with regard to the things of God ; from their infancy slow to learn what is good, though impetuously propense to learn and practise what is evil. (p. 43, 44.)

“ Job xiv. 4, and xv. 14. I join these, because the latter confirms the former, ‘Who can bring a clean thing,’ or person, ‘out of an unclean ? Not one.’ This is express. Job had been reflecting on the sorrowful, uncertain, imperfect state of all Adam’s children in the present world, ver. 1, 2, 3. Then he carries his thoughts to the spring of such a state, the original corruption of man. *Who*, what creature, can make an innocent righteous person proceed from a parent defiled by sin ? *Not one.* Through the whole Scripture we may observe, *sin* is described as *uncleanness*, and a sinner as an unclean thing. On the contrary, holiness is expressed by *cleanness* of heart and hands, and the righteous man is described as clean. Agreeably to which the text asserts the natural impossibility of any man’s being born clean, guiltless, and sinless, because he proceeds from them who are unclean ; guilty and defiled with sin.

“ The Septuagint translate the text, *Who shall be clean from filth ? Not one : even though his life on earth be a single day.* And this rendering, though not according to the Hebrew, is followed by all the fathers : and shows what was the general belief of the Jews, before Christ came into the world.

“ But since the *heavens* and *stars* are represented as *not clean*, compared to God, may not man also be here termed unclean, only as compared with him ?” I answer, 1. The heavens are manifestly compared with God ; but man is not, in either of these texts. He is here described, not as he is in comparison of God, but as he is absolutely in himself. 2. When *the heavens* and *man* are mentioned in the same text, and man is set forth as *unclean*, his *uncleanness* is expressed by his being *unrighteous* ; and that always means guilty or sinful. Nor indeed is the innocent frailty of mankind ever in Scripture termed *uncleanness*. (p. 45, 46.)

“ Psalm li. 5, ‘Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.’ The Psalmist here confesses, bewails, and condemns himself for his natural corruption as that which prin-

cipally gave birth to the horrid sins with which he had been overtaken; *Behold!* He prefixes this, to render his confession the more remarkable, and to show the importance of the truth here declared: *I was shapen*: this passive verb denotes somewhat in which neither David nor his parents had any active concern: *in or with iniquity*, and in or with sin did my mother conceive me. The word which we render conceive, signifies properly *to warm*, or *to cherish by warmth*. It does not therefore so directly refer to the act of *conceiving*, as to the *cherishing* what is conceived, till the time of its birth: But either way the proof is equally strong, for the corruption of mankind from their first existence. (p. 47, 48.)

“ Psalm lviii. 3, 4, ‘The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.’ ‘They are estranged from the womb.’ Strangers are averse to true, practical religion, from the birth. ‘They go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.’ Not that they actually speak lies as soon as they are born. But they naturally incline that way, and discover that inclination as early as is possible. (p. 51, 52.)

“ Prov. xxii. 15, ‘Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him. Chap. xxix. 15, ‘The rod and reproof give wisdom: but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame.’ These passages put together are a plain testimony of the inbred corruption of young children. *Foolishness*, in the former, is not barely appetite, or a want of the knowledge attainable by instruction.’ Neither of these deserve that sharp correction. But it is an indisposedness to what is good, and a strong propensity to evil. *This foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; it is rooted in his inmost nature.* It is as it were *fastened to him by strong cords*; so the original word signifies. From this corruption of heart in every child it is, that the *rod of correction* is necessary to give him *wisdom*; hence it is that a *child left to himself*, without correction, *brings his mother to shame*. If a child were born equally inclined to virtue and vice, why should the wise man speak of foolishness or wickedness, as fastened so closely to his heart? And why should the *rod and reproof* be so necessary for him? These texts therefore are another clear proof of the corruption of human nature.

“ Matt. xv. 18. Mark vii. 20—23, ‘Those things which proceed out of the mouth; come from the heart, and they defile the man. For from within out of the heart, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, murders—all these things come from within, and defile the man.’ Our Lord here teaches, that all evil thoughts, words, and actions, of every kind, flow out of the heart, the soul of man, as being now averse to all good, and inclined to all evil. (p. 55, 56.)

“ Rom. v. 12—19. Let the reader please to read the whole passage very carefully. The apostle here discourses of Adam and Christ as two representatives or public persons, comparing the *sin* of the one, with the *righteousness* of the other. (p. 66.)

“On this I observe, 1. The *one man* spoken of throughout, is Adam, the common head of mankind. And to him (not to the Devil or Eve) the apostle describes the introduction of *sin* and *death*. The Devil was the first sinner, and Eve seduced by him, sinned before her husband. Yet the apostle saith, ‘By *one man* sin entered into the world;’ through the *offence* of *one*, many are dead; the judgment was by *one* to condemnation; death reigned by *one*.’ ‘By the *offence* of *one*, judgment came upon all men;’ ‘by *one man’s* *disobedience* many were made sinners.’ Now why should the apostle lay all this on Adam, whose sin was posterior both to the Devil’s and Eve’s: if Adam was not appointed by God, the federal head of mankind? In regard to which the apostle points at him singly, as the *type* or *figure* of *him that was to come*. According to Dr. Taylor’s doctrine, he should rather have said, *By the Devil sin entered into the world*; or, *through the disobedience of Eve many were made sinners*. But instead of this he fixes on our first father alone, as bringing sin and death on all his posterity. (p. 67.)

“2. *The sin, transgression, offence, disobedience*, here spoken of, was Adam’s eating the forbidden fruit. It is remarkable, that as the apostle throughout his discourse, arraigns *one man* only, so he ascribes all the mischief done, to *one single offence* of that one man. And as he then stood in that special relation of federal, as well as natural head to his descendants, so upon his committing that one sin, this special relation ceased.

“3. The *all*, ver. 12. 18, and the *many*, ver. 15. 19, are all the natural descendants of Adam; equivalent with the *world*, ver. 12, which means, the inhabitants of it. (p. 69.)

“4. The effects of Adam’s sin on his descendants, the apostle reduces to two heads, sin and death. ‘By *one man* sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed on all men, for that all have sinned.’ *Sin* sometimes means *punishment*; but not here: *sin* and *death* are here plainly distinguished. The common translation is therefore right, and gives us the true meaning of the words. ‘Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,’ namely, in or with their first father. And this agrees with the context, the purport of which is, that all have sinned and are therefore liable to the death originally threatened, which is evident from this, that ‘until the law, sin was in the world’: in the ages that preceded the law of Moses, all men were sinners in the sight of God. ‘But sin is not imputed, where there is no law’: none can be sinners in the sight of God, if they are not transgressors of some law, for the transgressing of which they are reputed guilty. ‘Nevertheless death reigned’ all the time ‘from Adam to Moses,’ over all mankind. Now if none is liable to death, but for sin: if ‘sin is not imputed where there is no law;’ and if notwithstanding this, all mankind in all ages have died; infants themselves, who cannot actually sin, not excepted: it is undeniable, that guilt is imputed to all for the sin of Adam. Why else are they liable to that which is inflicted on none but for sin?

“This is the purport of the apostle’s arguing, ver. 12, 13, 14.

which having led him to mention Adam as a figure of Christ, he then draws a parallel between them. The substance of it is this; as through the ‘offence of Adam many are dead,’ as ‘by the disobedience’ of him ‘many are made sinners;’ so through the righteousness or ‘obedience of Christ, many are made righteous.’ But how are many dead, or made sinners through the disobedience of Adam? His first sin so far affects all his descendants as to constitute them guilty, or liable to all that death which was contained in the original threatening. (p. 72.)

“ But Dr. Taylor avers, ‘To *be made sinners* means only to be subjected to temporal death.’

“ I answer, 1. Whatever it means, the disobedience of Adam had a proper, casual influence upon it; just as the obedience of Christ has upon our being made righteous.

“ 2. What *to be made sinners* means, must be learned from the opposite to it, in the latter part of the verse. Now allowing the apostle to be his own interpreter, *being made righteous* is the same with *justification*. (ver. 16.) Of this he had treated largely before. And through the whole of his discourse, *to be justified*, is, to be acquitted from guilt, and *accepted of God* as righteous. Consequently, *to be made sinners* is to be *condemned of God*, or to be *children of wrath*, and that on account of Adam’s sin. (p. 73.)

“ 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, ‘By man came death: in Adam all die.’ Let the reader please to bear in mind the whole of the two verses and the context. By *man* in the 21st verse is meant Adam. The *all* spoken of are all his natural descendants. These *all die*; that is, as his descendants, are liable to death, yea, to death everlasting. That this is the meaning, appears hence: that the *being made alive*, to which this dying stands opposed, is not a mere recovery of life, but a blessed resurrection to a glorious immortality. Hence, I observe, 1. Man was originally immortal as well as righteous. In his primitive state, he was not liable to death. 2. Death is constantly ascribed to sin, as the sole and proper cause of it. As it was threatened only for sin, so the sentence was not pronounced till after man had sinned. 3. All men are mortal from their birth. As soon as they begin to live, they are liable to death, the punishment denounced against sin, and sin only. 4. This is the genuine effect of the first sin of our first father. The apostle does not attribute it to the Devil; neither does he say, *in Adam and Eve all die*. But here also he mentions Adam singly. Him he speaks of as *a figure of Christ*, ver. 45. 47, 48. And here as the sole author of death to all his natural descendants. *In Adam*, or on account of his fall, *all of mankind*, in every age, *die*. Consequently, *in him all sinned*. With him all fell in his first transgression. That they are all born liable to the legal punishment of sin, proves him the federal as well as natural head of mankind: whose sin is so far imputed to all men, that they are born ‘children of wrath,’ and liable to death. (p. 74—76.)

“ Thus have I considered a large number of texts, which testify

of *original sin, imputed and inherent*. Some are more express than others; of which kind are Job xiv. 4.; Psalm li. 5. lvi. 3.; Rom. v. 12, &c. 1 Cor. xv. 22.; Eph. ii. 3. That in Ephesians presents us with a direct proof of the entire doctrine. Those in Romans and Corinthians relate directly to original sin imputed, and are but consequential proofs of original corruption. The rest refer particularly to *this*, and are but consequential proofs of original sin imputed.

“And as this doctrine stands impregnable on the basis of Scripture, so it is perfectly agreeable to sound reason; as may appear from a few plain arguments which confirm this Scripture doctrine. (p. 79.)

“1. If the first man was by God’s appointment, as has been shown, the federal head of all his descendants; it follows, that when Adam sinned and fell, they all sinned in him and fell with him. And if they did, they must come into the world both guilty and unclean.

“But we had no hand in Adam’s sin, and therefore cannot be guilty on account of it.”

“This,—*We had no hand in it*, is ambiguous. It means either, ‘We did not actually join therein?’ which no one denies: or, ‘We were wholly unconcerned in it?’ the contrary to which has been fully proved.

“2. Since Adam’s posterity are born liable to death, which is the due wages of sin, it follows, that they are *born sinners*. No art can set aside the consequence.

“3. Either Christ is the Saviour of infants, or he is not. If he is not, how is he ‘the Saviour of all men?’ But if he is, then infants are sinners. For he suffered death for sinners only. He ‘came to seek and save *only* that which was lost;’ to ‘save his people from their sins.’ It follows that infants are sinners; that they are lost, and without Christ are undone for ever.

“4. The consequences of the contrary opinion are shockingly absurd.

“(1.) If original sin is not, either death is not the wages of sin, or there is punishment without guilt: God punishes innocent, guiltless creatures. To suppose which is to impute iniquity to the Most Holy. (p. 84.)

“(2.) If we are not sinners by nature, there are sinful actions without a principle, fruit growing without a root. ‘No: men contract sinful habits by *degrees*, and *then* commence sinners.’ But whence is it that they contract those habits so easily and speedily? Whence is it, that as soon as ever we discover reason we discover sinful dispositions? The early discoveries of reason, prove a principle of reason planted in our nature. In like manner the early discoveries of sinful dispositions, prove those dispositions planted therein. (p. 85.)

“(3.) If we were not ruined by the first Adam, neither are we recovered by the second. If the sin of Adam was not imputed to us, neither is the righteousness of Christ.

“(4.) If we do not derive a *corrupt nature* from Adam, we do not derive a *new nature* from Christ.

“ (5.) A denial of original sin not only renders baptism needless with regard to infants, but represents a great part of mankind as having no need of Christ, or the grace of the new covenant. I now speak of infants in particular, who, if not *guilty* before God, no more need the merits and grace of the second Adam than the brutes themselves.

“ Lastly. A denial of original sin contradicts the main design of the gospel, which is to humble vain man, and to ascribe to God’s *free grace*, not man’s *free will*, the whole of his salvation. Nor indeed can we let this doctrine go without giving up at the same time the greatest part, if not all, of the essential articles of the Christian faith. If we give up this, we cannot defend either justification by the merits of Christ, or the renewal of our natures by his Spirit. Dr. Taylor’s book is not therefore subversive of a particular branch, but of the whole scheme of Christianity.

“ VI. The doctrine therefore of original sin is not only a truth agreeable to Scripture and reason, but a truth of the utmost importance. And it is a truth to which the churches of Christ from the beginning have borne a clear testimony.

“ Few truths, if any, are more necessary to be known, believed, and thoroughly considered. For if we are not acquainted with this, we do not know ourselves. And if we do not know ourselves, we cannot rightly know Christ and the grace of God. And on this knowledge of Christ and the grace of God depends the whole of our salvation. Augustine therefore well remarks, ‘Christianity lies properly in the knowledge of what concerns Adam and Christ. For certainly if we do not know Christ, we know nothing to any purpose. And we cannot know Christ, without some knowledge of what relates to Adam, who was ‘the figure of him that was to come.

“ But if this doctrine is so important, why is so little said of it in Scripture, and in the writings of the ancients?”

“ This is a grand mistake. We totally deny that the Scripture says little of it. Dr. Taylor indeed affirms, ‘There are but five passages of Scripture that plainly relate to the effects of Adam’s fall.’ Not so. Many scriptures, as has been shown, plainly and directly teach us this doctrine. And many others deliver that from which it may be rationally and easily deduced. Indeed the whole doctrine of salvation by Christ and divine grace implies this; and each of its main branches, justification and regeneration, directly leads to it. So does the doctrine of man’s original righteousness, than which nothing is more clearly revealed. (p. 88.)

“ And if the writers before St. Augustine say little concerning it, is not the reason plain? The occasions of their writing did not lead them to enlarge, on what none had ever opposed or denied. For none had ever opposed or denied this doctrine. ‘Who,’ says Vicentius Lirinensis, ‘before Celestius, denied all mankind to be involved in the guilt of Adam’s transgression?’ Yet they are not silent concerning it. Justin Martyr speaks of ‘mankind, as fallen under death and the deceit of the serpent.’ (Dial. with Trypho.) Of ‘all Adam’s descendants, as condemned for his sin, and all that are Christ’s, as

justified by him.' In Irenæus there are numerous, strong, express testimonies, both to original righteousness and original sin in the full extent. 'What we lost in Adam, that is, a being *after the image and likeness of God*, this we recover by Christ.' (l. 3. c. 20.) Again, 'They who receive the engrafted word return to the ancient nature of man, that by which he was made 'after the image and likeness of God.' (l. 5. c. 10.) He likewise speaks of our 'sinning in Adam; 'In the first Adam,' says he, 'we offended God; in the second Adam, we are reconciled.' And frequently, of 'man's losing the image of God by the fall, and recovering it by Christ.' Tertullian says, 'Man was in the beginning deceived, and therefore condemned to death: upon which his whole race became infected and partaker of his condemnation.' (*De testimonio animæ*.) Cyprian is express in his epistle to Fidus. Origen says, 'The curse of Adam is common to all. Again, Man by sinning lost the image and likeness of God.' And again, 'No one is clean from the filth of sin, even though he is not above a day old.' (p. 93.)

" 'The whole of me,' says Nazianzen, 'has need of being saved, since the whole of me fell, and was condemned for the disobedience of my first father.' Many more are the testimonies of Athanasius, Basil, Hilary; all prior to Augustine. And how generally since Augustine this important truth has been asserted, is well known. Plain it is therefore that the churches of Christ from the beginning, have borne clear testimony to it.

" To conclude. 1. This is a scriptural doctrine. Many plain texts directly teach it.

" 2. It is a rational doctrine, thoroughly consistent with the dictates of sound reason: and this, notwithstanding there may be some circumstances relating thereto, which human reason cannot fathom. (p. 91.)

" 3. It is a practical doctrine. It has the closest connexion with the life, power, and practice of religion. It leads men to the foundation of all Christian practice, the knowledge of himself: and hereby, to the knowledge of God, and the knowledge of Christ crucified. It prepares him for, and confirms him in, just conceptions of the dependence of his salvation, on the merits of Christ for justification, and the power of his Spirit for inward and outward holiness. It humbles the natural pride of man: it excludes self-applause and boasting: and points out the true and only way whereby we may fulfil all righteousness.

" 4. It is an experimental doctrine. The sincere Christian day by day carries the proof of it in his own bosom: experiencing that in himself which is abundantly sufficient to convince him, that 'in him' by nature 'dwelleth no good thing; ' but that 'it is God alone who worketh in him, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure.'

LEWISHAM, March 23, 1757.

I HAVE now gone through, as my leisure would permit, this whole complicated question; and I have spoken on each branch of it with plainness and openness, according to the best light I have at

present. I have only a few words more to add, and that with the same openness and simplicity.

What I have often acknowledged, I now repeat. Were it not on a point of so deep importance, I would no more enter the lists with Dr. Taylor, than I would lift my hand against a giant. I acknowledge your abilities of every kind: your natural and acquired endowments; your strong understanding, your lively and fruitful imagination, your plain and easy, yet nervous style. I make no doubt of your having studied the original Scriptures for many years. And I believe you have moral endowments, which are infinitely more valuable and more amiable than all these. For (if I am not greatly deceived) you bear *good-will to all men*. And may not I add, you fear God?

O what might not you do, with these abilities? What would be too great for you to attempt and effect? Of what service might you be not only to your own countrymen, but to all that bear the Christian name? How might you advance the cause of true, primitive, scriptural Christianity? Of solid, rational virtue? Of the deep, holy, happy, spiritual religion, which is brought to light by the gospel? How capable are you of recommending, not barely morality, (the duty of man to man,) but piety, the duty of man to God? Even the 'worshipping him in spirit and in truth?' How well qualified are you, to explain, enforce, defend, even 'the deep things of God?' The nature of the kingdom of God *within us*? Yea, the *interiora regni Dei*? (I speak on supposition of your having the 'unction of the Holy One,' added to your other qualifications.) And are you, whom God has so highly favoured, among those who serve the opposite cause? If one might transfer the words of a man to him, might not one conceive him to say, *Kai σὺ εἶ εκεῖνος, καὶ σὺ τεκνός*; Are you disowning the cause of inward religion? Labouring to destroy the inward kingdom of God? Sapping the foundation of all true, *spiritual* worship? Advancing morality on the ruins of piety? Are you among those who are overthrowing the very foundations of primitive, scriptural Christianity? Which certainly can have no ground to stand upon, if the scheme lately advanced be true. What room is there for it, till men repent? Know themselves? Without this can they know or love God? O why should you block up the way to repentance? And consequently, to the whole religion of the heart? 'Let a man be a fool,' says the Apostle, that 'he may be wise.' But you tell him, he is wise already: that every man is by nature, as wise as Adam was in Paradise. He gladly drinks in the soothing sound, and sleeps on and takes his rest. We beseech those who are *mad* after earthly things, to take knowledge of the dreadful state they are in. To return to their Father, and beg of him 'the Spirit of love and of a sound mind.' You tell them, they are of a *sound mind* already. They believe, and turn to their husks again. Jesus comes to 'seek and save that which is lost.' You tell the *men of form*, (though as dead to God as a stone,) that they are not lost: that (inasmuch as they are free from gross sins) they are in a good way, and will undoubtedly be saved. So they live and die, without the knowledge, love, or image of God, and die eternally!

"They *will* be saved." But *are* they saved already? We know all real Christians are. If they are, if these are possessed of the *present salvation* which the Scriptures speak of, what is that salvation? How poor, dry, dull, shallow, superficial a thing? Wherein does it excel what the wiser Heathens taught, nay, and perhaps experienced? What poor, pitiable creatures are those Christians, so called, who have advanced no higher than this? You see enough of these on every side: perhaps even in your own congregation. What knowledge have they of the things of God? What love to God, or to Christ? What heavenly-mindedness? How much of the 'mind which was in Christ Jesus?' How little have they profited by all your instructions? How few are wiser and better than when you knew them first? O take knowledge of the reason why they are not. That doctrine will not make them wise unto salvation.' All it can possibly do, is to shake off the leaves. It does not affect the branches of sin. Unholy tempers are just as they were. Much less does it strike at the root: pride, self-will, unbelief, heart-idolatry, remain undisturbed, and unsuspected.

I am grieved for the people who are thus seeking death in the error of their life. I am grieved for *you*, who surely desire to teach them the way of God in truth. O Sir, think it possible that you may have been mistaken! That you may have leaned too far, to what you thought the better extreme. Be persuaded once more to review your whole cause, and that from the very foundation. And in doing so, you will not disdain to desire more than natural light. O that 'the Father of glory,' may 'give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation!' May he 'enlighten the eyes of your understanding, that you may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints!'

LEWISHAM, March 24, 1757.

PART VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

Because of the unspeakable importance of thoroughly understanding this grand foundation of all revealed religion, I subjoin one more extract, relating both to the original and the present state of man.

"God made man upright.* *By man* we are to understand our *first parents*, the archetypal pair, the root of mankind. This man was made right, (agreeably to the nature of God, whose work is perfect,) without any imperfection, corruption, or principle of corruption, in his body or soul. He was made upright, that is, straight with the will and law of God, without any irregularity in his soul. God made him thus; he did not first make him, and then make him right.

* Mr. BOSTON's Four-fold State of Man.

cous: but in the very making of him he made him righteous: righteousness was concreated with him. With the same breath that God breathed into him a living soul, he breathed into him a righteous soul.

“ This righteousness was the conformity of all the faculties and powers of his soul to the moral law: which implied three things.

“ First, his understanding was a lamp of light. He was made after God’s image, and consequently could not want knowledge, which is a part thereof. And a perfect *knowledge of the law* was necessary to fit him for universal obedience, seeing no obedience can be according to the law unless it proceed from a sense of the command of God requiring it. It is true, Adam had not the law written on tables of stone; but it was written upon his mind. God impressed it upon his soul, and made him *a law to himself*, as the remains of it, even among the Heathens testify. And seeing man was made to be the mouth of the creation, to glorify God in his works, we have ground to believe, he had an exquisite knowledge of the works of God. We have a proof of this in his giving names to the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the air, and these such as express their nature. ‘ Whosoever Adam called every living thing, that was the name thereof.’ And the dominion which God gave him over the creatures, soberly to use them according to his will, (still in subordination to the Will of God,) implies a knowledge of their natures.

“ Secondly, His will lay straight with the will of God. There was no corruption in his will, no bent or inclination to evil; for that is sin, properly so called: and, therefore, inconsistent with that uprightness with which it is expressly said he was endued at his creation. The will of man was then *naturally* inclined to God and goodness, though *mutably*. It was disposed by its original make to follow the Creator’s will, as the shadow does the body. It was not left in an equal balance to good and evil; for then he had not been upright, or conform to the law; which no more can allow the creature not to be inclined to God as his end, than it can allow man to be a *god* to himself.

“ Thirdly, His affections were regular, pure, and holy. All his passions, yea all his *sensitive* motions and inclinations were subordinate to his reason and will, which lay straight with the will of God. They were all, therefore, pure from all defilement, free from all disorder or distemper; because all their motions were duly subjected to his clear reason and his holy will. He had also an *executive power*, answerable to his will: a power to do the good which he knew should be done, and which he inclined to do; even to fulfil the whole law of God. If it had not been so, God would not have required perfect obedience of him. For to say, that ‘the Lord gathereth where he hath not strewed,’ is but the blasphemy of a slothful servant.

“ From what has been said it may be gathered, that man’s original righteousness was *universal* and *natural*, yet *mutable*.

“ 1. It was universal, both with respect to the subject of it, the whole man, and the object of it, the whole law: it was diffusel

through the *whole* man ; it was a blessed leaven that leavened the whole lump. Man was then holy in soul, body, and spirit : while the soul remained untainted, the members of the body were consecrated vessels and instruments of righteousness. A combat between reason and appetite, nay the least inclination to sin, was utterly inconsistent with this uprightness in which man was created ; and has been invented to veil the corruption of man's nature, and to obscure the grace of God in Christ Jesus. And as this righteousness spread through the whole man, so it respected the whole law. There was nothing in the law, but what was agreeable to his reason and will. His soul was shapen out in length and breadth, to the *commandment*, though exceeding broad ; so that his original righteousness was not only perfect in parts but in degrees.

“ 2. As it was universal, so it was *natural* to him. He was created with it. And it was necessary to the perfection of man, as he came out of the hand of God : necessary to constitute him in a state of integrity. Yet

“ 3. It was *mutable*. It was a righteousness which might be lost, as appears from the sad event. His will was not indifferent to good and evil : God set it towards good only, yet did not so fix it, that it could not alter ; it was moveable to evil, but by man himself only.

“ Thus was man made *originally righteous*, being ‘ created in God's own image,’ (Gen. i. 27,) which consists in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. (Col. iii. 10. Eph. iv. 24.) All that God made was *very good*, according to their several natures. (Gen. i. 31.) And so man was morally good, being *made after the image* of him who is *good and upright*. (Psa. xxv. 8.) Without this he could not have answered the end of his creation, which was to know, love, and serve his God. Nay, he *could not* be created otherwise. For he must either have been *conformed* to the law in his powers, principles, and inclinations, or not. If he was, he was *righteous* ; if not, he was a *sinner*, which is absurd and horrible to imagine.

“ And as man was *holy*, so he was *happy*. He was full of peace as well as of love. And he was the favourite of heaven. He bore the image of God, who cannot but love his own image. While he was alone in the world he was not alone, for he had free, full *communion with God*. As yet there was nothing to turn away the face of God from the work of his own hands : seeing sin had not as yet entered, which alone could make the breach.

“ He was also *lord of the world*, universal emperor of the whole earth. His Creator gave him ‘ dominion over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and every thing that moveth on the earth.’ He was God's deputy-governor in the lower world ; and this his dominion was an image of God's sovereignty. Thus was man ‘ crowned with glory and honour, having all things put under his feet.’

“ Again, as he had perfect tranquillity in his own breast, so he had a perfect calm without. His heart had nothing to reproach him with, and without there was nothing to annoy him. Their beautiful bodies were not capable of injuries from the air. They were liable

to no diseases or pains; and though they were not to live idle, yet toil, weariness, and sweat of the brows, were not known in this state.

“Lastly, He was immortal. He would never have died if he had not sinned. Death was threatened only in case of sin. The perfect constitution of his body, which came out of God’s hand was very good, and the righteousness of his soul removed all inward causes of death. And God’s special care of his innocent creature secured him against outward violence. Such were the holiness and the happiness of man in his original state.

“But there is now a sad alteration in our nature. It is now entirely corrupted. Where at first there was nothing evil, there is now nothing good: I shall,

“First, Prove this:

“Secondly, Represent this corruption in its several parts:

“Thirdly; Show how man’s nature comes to be thus corrupted.

“First, I shall prove that man’s nature is corrupted, both by God’s word, and by men’s experience and observation.

“I. For proof from God’s word, let us consider,

“1. How it takes particular notice of fallen Adam’s communicating his image to his posterity. Gen. v. iii, ‘Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image.’ Compare this with ver. 1, ‘In the day that God created man, in the image of God made he him.’ Behold here, how the image after which man was made, and the image after which he is begotten, are opposed. Man was made in the likeness of God; a holy and righteous God made a holy and righteous creature; but fallen Adam begat a son, not in the likeness of God, but in his own likeness: corrupt, sinful Adam, begat a corrupt, sinful son. For as the image of God included righteousness and immortality, so this image of fallen Adam, included corruption and death. Moses giving us in this chapter the first bill of mortality that ever was in the world, ushers it in with this observation, that *dying Adam* begat *mortals*. Having sinned he became mortal, according to the threatening. And so he ‘begat a son in his own likeness,’ sinful and therefore mortal; and so ‘sin and death passed on all.’

“Let us consider, 2. that text, Job xiv. 4, ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.’ Our first parents were unclean; how then can we be clean? How could our immediate parents be clean? Or how shall our children be so? The uncleanness here mentioned is a sinful uncleanness; for it is such as makes man’s days ‘full of trouble.’ And it is natural, being derived from unclean parents. ‘How can he be clean that is born of a woman?’ God can bring a clean thing out of an unclean; and did so in the case of the man, Christ; but no other can. Every person then that is born according to the course of nature is born unclean; if the root be corrupt so are the branches. Neither is the matter mended, though the parents be holy. For they are such by *grace*, not by *nature*: and they beget their children as men, not as holy men; wherefore as the circumcised parent begets an uncircumcised

child, so the holiest parents beget unholy children, and cannot communicate their grace to them as they do their nature.

“ 3. Hear our Lord’s determination of the point. John iii. 6, ‘ That which is born of the flesh is flesh.’ Behold the corruption of all mankind ; all are flesh. It does not mean all are frail (though that is a sad truth too : yea, and our natural frailty is an evidence of our natural corruption :) but, all are corrupt and sinful, and that naturally. Hence our Lord argues, that because they are flesh, therefore they ‘ must be born again,’ or they ‘ cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ ver. 3, 5. And as the corruption of our nature evidences the necessity of regeneration, so the necessity of regeneration, proves the corruption of our nature. For why should a man need a second birth if his nature were not ruined in the first birth ? Even infants must be born again, for this rule admits of no exception. And, therefore, they were circumcised under the Old Testament, as having ‘ the body of the sins of the flesh,’ (which is conveyed to them by natural generation,) the whole old man, *to put off*. (Col. ii. 11.) And now by the appointment of Christ, they are to be baptized ; which shows they are unclean, and that there is no salvation for them, but ‘ by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.’

“ 4. ‘ We are by nature children of wrath.’ We are worthy of, and liable to the wrath of God : and that *by nature* ; and therefore doubtless we are by nature sinful creatures. We are condemned before we have done good or evil ; under the curse ere we know what it is. But ‘ will a lion roar in the forest while he hath no prey ?’ Will a holy and just God roar in his wrath against man, if he be not by his sin made a prey for wrath ? No, he will not, he cannot. We conclude then, that according to the word of God, man’s nature is a corrupt nature.

“ If we consult experience, and observe the case of the world, in the things that are obvious to any person, we shall by its fruits easily discover the root of bitterness. I shall instance but in a few.

“ 1. Who sees not a flood of miseries overflowing the world ? Every one at home and abroad, in city and country, in palaces and cottages, is groaning under some unpleasing circumstance or other. Some are oppressed with poverty or want, some chastened with pain or sickness : some are lamenting their losses ; none is without a cross of one sort or another. No man’s condition is so soft but there is some thorn of uneasiness in it. And at length death, *the wages of sin*, comes and sweeps all away. Now what but sin has opened the sluice ? There is not a complaint or sigh heard in the world, or a tear that falls from our eye, but it is an evidence, that man is fallen as a star from heaven. For God ‘ distributeth sorrows in his anger.’ (Job xxi. 17.) This is a plain proof of the corruption of nature : forasmuch as those that have not actually sinned, have their share of these sorrows ; yea, and draw their first breath weeping. There are also graves of the smallest as well as the largest size : and there

are never wanting some in the world, who, like Rachel, are ‘weeping for their children, because they are not.’

“ 2. How early does this corruption of nature appear? It is soon discerned which way the bias of the heart lies. Do not the children of fallen Adam, before they can go alone, follow their father’s footsteps? What pride, ambition, curiosity, vanity, wilfulness, and averseness to good appear in them? And when they creep out of infancy, there is a necessity of using ‘the rod of correction to drive away the foolishness that is bound in their heart.’

“ 3. Take a view of the out-breakings of sin in the world. ‘The wickedness of man is *yet* great in the earth.’ Behold the bitter fruits of corrupt nature! ‘By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out,’ (like the breaking forth of waters,) ‘and blood toucheth blood.’ The world is filled with all manner of filthiness, wickedness, and impiety. And whence is this deluge of sin on the earth, but from the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep, *the heart of man*, out of which ‘proceed adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness.’ Ye may, it may be, thank God, that ye are not in these respects, ‘like other men.’ And you have reason, for the corruption of nature is the very same in you as in them.

“ 4. Cast your eye upon those terrible convulsions the world is thrown into by the wickedness of men. Lions prey not on lions, nor wolves on wolves; but men bite and devour one another. Upon how slight occasions will men sheathe their swords in one another’s bowels? Since Cain shed Abel’s blood, the world has been turned into a slaughter-house. And the chase has been continued, ever since Nimrod began his hunting: as on the earth, so in the seas, the greater still devouring the lesser. Now when we see the world in such a ferment, every one stabbing another with words or swords; these violent heats among the sons of Adam, speak the whole body to be distempered: ‘the whole head to be sick, and the whole heart faint.’

“ 5. Consider the necessity of human laws, fenced with terrors and severities. Man was made for society: and God himself said when he created him, it was not good for him to be alone. Yet the case is such now, that in society, he must be hedged in with thorns. And that from hence we may the better discern the corruption of man’s nature, consider, 1. Every man naturally loves to be at full liberty himself; and, were he to follow his inclination, would vote himself out of the reach of all laws, divine and human. Yet, 2. No man would willingly venture to live in a lawless society: and, therefore, even pirates and robbers have laws among themselves: Thus men show they are conscious of the corruption of nature, not daring to trust one another but upon security. 3. How dangerous soever it is to break through the hedge, yet many will do it daily. They will not only sacrifice their conscience and credit, but for the pleasure of a few moments, lay themselves open to a violent death, by the laws of the land wherein they live. 4. Laws are often made

to yield to man's lusts. Sometimes whole societies break off the fetters, and the voice of laws cannot be heard for the noise of arms. And seldom there is a time, wherein there are not some persons so great and daring, that the laws dare not look them in the face. 5. Observe even the Israelites, separated to God from all the nations of the earth. Yet what horrible confusions were among them, when 'there was no king in Israel ? How hard was it to reform them, when they had the best of magistrates ? And how quickly did they turn aside again, when they had wicked rulers ? It seems one grand design of that sacred history, was to discover the corruption of man's nature. 6. Consider the remains of natural corruption even in them that believe. Though grace has entered, corruption is not expelled; they find it with them at all times and in all places. If a man have an ill neighbour, he may remove ; but should he go into a wilderness, or pitch his tent on a remote rock in the sea, there it will be with him. I need not stand to prove so clear a point. But consider these few things on this head. 1. If it be thus in the green tree, how must it be in the dry ? Does so much of the *old* remain even in those who have received a *new nature* ? How great then must that corruption be in those, where it is unmixed with renewing grace ? 2. Though natural corruption is no burden to a natural man, is he therefore free from it ? No, no. Only he is dead, and feels not the sinking weight. Many a groan is heard from a sick-bed, but never one from a grave. 3. The good man resists the old nature : he strives to starve it; yet it remains. How must it spread then and strengthen itself in the soul, where it is not starved, but fed, as in unbelievers ? If the garden of the diligent find him full work, in cutting off and roofing up, surely that of the sluggard must needs be all grown over with thorns.'

" I shall add but one observation more, that in every man naturally the image of fallen Adam appears : to evince which, I appeal to the consciences of all, in the following particulars.

" 1. If God by his holy law or wise providence put a restraint upon us, to keep us back from any thing, does not that restraint whet the edge of our natural inclinations, and make us so much the keener in our desires ? The very Heathens were convinced, that there is this spirit of contradiction in us, though they knew not the spring of it. How often do men give themselves a loose in those things wherein if God had left them at liberty, they would have bound up themselves ? And is not this a repeating of our father's folly, that men will rather climb for forbidden fruit, than gather what providence offers to them, when they have God's express allowance for it ?

" 2. Is it not natural to us, to care for the body at the expense of the soul ? This was one ingredient in the sin of our first parents. (Gen. iii. 6.) O how happy might we be, if we were but at half the pains about our souls, which we bestow upon our bodies ? If that question, ' What must I do to be saved ? ' did but run near so often

through our minds, as those, ‘ What shall we eat ? ‘ What shall we drink ? ‘ Wherewithal shall we be clothed ?

“ 3. Is not every one by nature discontent with his present lot, or with some one thing or other in it ? Some one thing is always missing : so that man is a creature given to change. If any doubt of this, let them look over all their enjoyments, and after a review of them, listen to their own hearts, and they will hear a secret murmuring, for want of something. Since the hearts of our first parents wandered from God, their posterity have a natural disease, which Solomon calls, ‘ The wandering of desire,’ literally, *The walking of the soul.* (Eccles. vi. 9.) This is a sort of diabolical trance, wherein the soul traverseth the world, feeds itself with a thousand airy nothings, snatcheth at this and the other imagined excellency : goes here, and there, and every where, except where it should go. And the soul is never cured of this disease, till it takes up its rest in God through Christ.

“ 4. Do not Adam’s children naturally follow his footsteps, in *hiding* themselves ‘ from the presence of the Lord ? ’ (Gen. iii. 8.) We are just as blind in this matter as he was, who thought to ‘ hide himself from the presence of the Lord among the trees of the garden.’ We promise ourselves more security in a secret sin, than in one that is openly committed. ‘ The adulterer saith, No eyes shall see me.’ And men will freely do that in secret, which they would be ashamed to do in the presence of a child : as if darkness could hide from an all-seeing God. Are we not naturally careless of communion with God ? Nay, and averse to it ? Never was there any communion between God and Adam’s children, where God himself had not the first word. If he would let them alone, they would never inquire after him.

“ 5. How loth are men to confess sin, to take guilt and shame to themselves ? And was it not thus in the case before us ? Adam confesses his nakedness, (which indeed he could not deny) but not one word does he say about his sin. It is as natural for us to hide sin as to commit it. Many instances of this we see daily ; but how many will there be in that day, when God ‘ will judge the secrets of men ? ’ Many a foul mouth will then be seen, which is now wiped and saith, ‘ I have done no wickedness.’

“ Lastly, is it not natural for us to *extenuate* our sin, and *transfer* the guilt to others ? As Adam laid the blame of his sin on the woman ? And did not the woman lay the blame on the serpent ? Adam’s children need not be taught this ; for before they can well speak, if they cannot deny, they lisp out something to lessen their fault, and lay the blame upon another. Nay so natural is this to men, that in the greatest of sins they will charge the fault upon God himself ; blaspheming his Providence under the name of *ill-luck* or *misfortune*, and so laying the blame of their sin at heaven’s door. Thus does ‘ the foolishness of man pervert his ways : ’ and his heart fretteth against the Lord. Let us then call Adam, father : let us not deny the relation, seeing we bear his image.

“ I proceed to inquire into the *corruption of nature* in the several parts of it. But who can take the exact dimensions of it, in its breadth, length, height, and depth ? The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked : who can know it ? However we may quickly perceive so much of it, as may show the absolute necessity of regeneration. Man in his natural state is altogether corrupt, through all the faculties of his soul : corrupt in his understanding, his will, his affections, his conscience, and his memory.

“ 1. The understanding is despoiled of its primitive glory, and covered over with confusion. We are fallen into the hands of our grand adversary, and are deprived of our two eyes. ‘ There is none that understandeth ;’ the ‘ very mind and conscience’ of the natural man are *defiled or spoiled*. But to point out this corruption of the understanding more particularly, let the following things be considered.

“ First, There is a natural *weakness* in the minds of men, with respect to spiritual things. How hard is it to teach them the common principles of religion, to make truths so plain, that they may understand them ? Try the same persons in other things, speak of the things of this world, and they will understand quickly : but it is hard to make them know, how their souls may be saved, or how their hearts may find rest in Christ. Consider even those who have many advantages above the common run of mankind : yet how small is their knowledge of divine things ! What confusion still remains in their minds ? How often are they mired, and speak as a child, even in the matter of practical truths ? It is a pitiable weakness, that we cannot perceive the things which God has revealed. And it must needs be a sinful weakness, since the law of God requires us to know and believe them.

“ Secondly, Man’s understanding is naturally overwhelmed with gross *darkness* in spiritual things. Man, at the instigation of the Devil, attempting to break out a new light in his mind, instead of that, broke up the doors of the bottomless pit, by the smoke whereof he was covered with darkness. When God at first made man, his mind was a lamp of light ; but sin has now turned it into darkness. Sin has closed the window of the soul. It is the land of darkness and the shadow of death, where ‘ the light is as darkness.’ The prince of darkness reigns therein, and nothing but the works of darkness are framed there. That you may be the more fully convinced of this, take the following evidences of it.

“ 1. The darkness that was upon the face of the world before, and at the time that Christ came. When Adam by his sin had lost his light, it pleased God to reveal to him the way of salvation. (Gen. iii. 15.) This was handed down by holy men before the flood : yet the natural darkness of the mind of man so prevailed, as to carry off all sense of true religion from the old world, except what remained in Noah’s family. After the flood, as men increased, their natural darkness of mind prevailed again, and the light decayed, till it died out among the generality of mankind, and was preserved only among

the posterity of Shem. And even with them it was near setting, when God called Abraham from ‘serving other gods.’ (Josh. xxiv. 15.) God gave him a more full revelation, which he communicated to his family : (Gen. xxiii. 19.) Yet the natural darkness wore it out at length, save that it was preserved among the posterity of Jacob. In Egypt that darkness so prevailed over them also, that a new revelation was necessary. And many a dark cloud got above that, during the time from Moses to Christ. When Christ came, nothing was to be seen in the Gentile world, but ‘darkness and cruel habitations.’ They were drowned in superstition and idolatry : and whatever wisdom was among their philosophers, ‘the world by that wisdom knew not God,’ but became more and more vain in their imaginations. Nor were the Jews much wiser : except a few, gross darkness covered them also. Their traditions were multiplied ; but the knowledge of those things wherein the life of religion lies, was lost. They gloried in outward ordinances, but knew nothing of ‘worshipping God in Spirit and in truth.’

“ Now what but the natural darkness of men’s minds, could still thus wear out the light of external revelation ? Men did not forget the way of preserving their lives : but how quickly did they forget the way of saving their souls ? So that it was necessary for God himself to reveal it again and again. Yea, and a mere external revelation did not suffice to remove this darkness : no, not when it was by Christ in person : there needed also the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Such is the natural darkness of our minds, that it only yields to the Blood and Spirit of Christ.

“ 2. Every natural man’s heart, how refined soever he appear, is full of darkness, disorder, and confusion. The unrenewed part o’ mankind are rambling through the world, like so many blind men, who will neither take a guide, nor can guide themselves, and therefore fall over this and the other precipice into destruction. Some are running after their covetousness, some sticking in the mire of sensuality, others dashing on the rock of pride ; every one stumbling on one stone of stumbling or other, as their unmortified passions drive them. And while some are lying along in the way, others are coming up and falling headlong over them. Errors swarm in the world : all the unregenerate are utterly mistaken in the point of true happiness. All desire to be happy ; but touching the way to happiness, there are almost as many opinions as there are men. They are like the blind Sodomites about Lot’s house, all seeking to find the door but in vain. Look into thine own heart, (if thou art not born again,) and thou wilt see all turned upside down ; heaven lying under, the earth a-top : look into thy life, and see how thou art playing the madman, eagerly flying after that which is not, and slighting that which is, and will be for ever. Thus is man’s understanding naturally overwhelmed with gross darkness in spiritual things.

“ Thirdly, There is in the mind of man a natural *bias to evil* : let us reflect a little, and we shall find incontestible evidence of it.

“1. Men’s minds have a natural dexterity to do mischief: none are so simple as to want skill for this. None need to be taught it; but as weeds without being sown, grow up of their own accord, so does this earthly, sensual, devilish wisdom, naturally grow up in us.

“2. We naturally form gross conceptions of spiritual things, as if the soul were quite immersed in flesh and blood. Let men but look into themselves, and they will find this bias in their mind: whereof the idolatry which still prevails so far and wide, is an incontestible evidence. For it plainly shows, men would have a visible deity; therefore they change the ‘glory of the incorruptible God into an image.’ Indeed the reformation of these nations, has banished gross idolatry out of our churches. But heart-reformation alone can banish mental-idolatry, subtle and refined image-worship out of our minds.

“3. How difficult is it to detain the carnal mind before the Lord! To fix it in the meditation of spiritual things? When God is speaking to man by his word, or they are speaking to him in prayer, the body remains before God, but the world steals away the heart. Though the eyes be closed, the man sees a thousand vanities, and the mind roves hither and thither: and many times the man scarce comes to himself, till he is ‘gone from the presence of the Lord.’ The worldly man’s mind does not wander when he is contriving business, casting up his accounts, or telling his money. If he answers you not at first, he tells you, he did not hear you, he was busy, his mind was fixed. But the carnal mind, employed about spiritual things, is out of its element, and therefore cannot fix.

“4. Consider how the carnal *imagination* supplies the want of real objects to the corrupt heart. The unclean person is filled with speculative impurities, ‘having eyes full of adultery.’ The covetous man fills his heart with the world, if he cannot get his hands full of it. The malicious person acts his revenge in his own breast: the envious within his own narrow soul, sees his neighbour laid low enough: and so every lust is fed by the imagination. These things may suffice to convince us, of the natural bias of the mind to evil.

“Fourthly, There is in the carnal mind an *opposition to spiritual truths*, and an aversion to receiving them. God has revealed to sinners the way of salvation; he has given his word. But do natural men believe it? Indeed they do not. They believe not the promises of the word: for they who receive them are thereby made ‘partakers of the divine nature.’ They believe not the word: otherwise they could not live as they do. I doubt not but most if not all of you, who are in a state of nature, will here plead, not guilty. But the very difficulty you find in assenting to this truth proves the unbelief with which I charge you. Has it not proceeded so far with some, that it has steeled their foreheads, openly to reject all revealed religion? And though ye set not your mouths as they do against the heavens, yet the same bitter root of unbelief is in you, and reigns and will reign in you till overcoming grace captivate your minds to the belief of the truth. To convince you of this,

“Consider, 1. How have you learned those truths which you

think you believe ? Is it not merely by the benefit of your education, and of external revelation ? You are strangers to the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness with the word in your hearts : and therefore ye are still unbelievers. ‘ It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God.’ ‘ Every one therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father,’ saith our Lord, ‘ cometh unto me.’ But ye have not come to Christ : therefore ye have not been ‘ taught of God.’ Ye have not been so taught, and therefore ye have not come : ye believe not.

“ Consider, 2. The utter inconsistency of most men’s lives with the principles which they profess. They profess to believe the Scripture : but how little are they concerned about what is revealed therein ? How unconcerned are ye even about that weighty point, whether ye be born again or not ? Many live as they were born, and are like to die as they live, and yet live in peace. Do such believe the sinfulness of a natural state ? Do they believe they are ‘ children of wrath ?’ Do they believe there is no salvation without regeneration ? And no regeneration but what makes man ‘ a new creature ?’ O no ! If ye did, ye could not live in your sins, live out of Christ, and yet hope for mercy.

“ Fifthly, Man is naturally high-minded. Lowliness is not a flower which grows in the field of nature. It is natural to man to think highly of himself, and what is his own. ‘ Vain man would be wise :’ so he accounts himself, and so he would be accounted by others. His way is right because it is *his own* ; for ‘ every way of a man is right in his own eyes.’ He is ‘ alive without the law,’ and therefore his hope is strong, and his confidence firm. It is another tower of Babel : the word batters it, yet it stands. One while breaches are made in it, but they are quickly repaired. At another time, it is all made to shake ; but it is still kept up ; till God’s Spirit raises a *heart-quake* within the man, which tumbles it down, and leaves not one stone upon another.

“ Thus much of the corruption of the understanding. Call the understanding *Ichabod* ; ‘ for the glory is departed from it.’ Consider this, ye that are yet in the state of nature, and groan ye out your ease before the Lord, that the Sun of Righteousness may arise upon you, before ye be shut up in everlasting darkness. What avails your worldly wisdom ? What do all your attainments in religion avail, while your understanding lies wrapped up in darkness and confusion, utterly void of the Light of Life ?

“ II. Nor is the Will less corrupted than the understanding. It was at first faithful, and ruled with God : but now it is turned traitor against God, and rules with and for the Devil. To open this plague of the heart, let the following things be considered.

“ First, there is in the unrenewed Will an utter inability for what is truly good in the sight of God. Indeed a natural man has a power to choose and do what is *materially* good : but though he can will what is good and right, he can do nothing *aright and well*. ‘ Without me,’ that is, separate from me, ‘ ye can do nothing ;’ nothing truly and spiritually good. To evidence this, consider,

“ 1. How often do men see the good they should choose, and the evil they should refuse ; and yet their hearts have no more power to comply with their light, than if they were arrested by some invisible hand ? Their consciences tell them the right way : yet cannot their will be brought up to it. Else, how is it, that the clear arguments on the side of virtue, do not bring men over to that side ? Although heaven and hell were but a *may be*, even this would determine the will to holiness, could it be determined by reason. Yet so far is it from this, that men ‘ knowing the judgment of God, that they who do such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.’

“ 2. Let those who have been truly convinced of the *spirituality* of the law, speak and tell if they then found themselves able to *incline* their hearts toward it. Nay, the more that light shone in their souls, did they not find their hearts more and *more unable* to comply with it ? Yea, there are some who are yet in the Devil’s camp that can tell from their own experience, light let into the mind cannot give life to the will, or enable it to comply therewith.

“ Secondly, There is in the unrenewed will an *averseness to good*. Sin is the natural man’s element ; and he is as loth to part with it. as the fishes are to come out of the water. He is sick ; but utterly averse to the remedy ; he loves his disease, so that he loathes the physician. He is a captive, a prisoner, and a slave ; but he loves his conqueror, jailer, and master : he is fond of his fetters, prison, and drudgery, and has no liking to his liberty. For evidence of this averseness to good in the will of man,

“ Consider, 1. The *untowardness of children*. How averse are they to restraint ? Are they not ‘as bullocks unaccustomed to the yoke ?’ Yea, it is far easier to tame young bullocks to the yoke, than to bring young children under discipline. Every man may see in this as in a glass, that man is naturally wild and wilful ; that according to Zophar’s observation, he is ‘born a wild ass’s colt.’ What can be said more ? He is like a colt, the colt of an ass, the colt of a *wild ass* : ‘a wild ass used to the wilderness, that snuffeth up the wind at her pleasure : in her occasion, who can turn her away ?’

“ 2. What pain and difficulty do men find in *bringing* their hearts to religious duties ? And what a task is it to the natural man to *abide* at them ? To leave the world but a little, and converse with God ? When they are engaged in worldly business or company, time seems to fly and is gone before they are aware. But how heavily does it drive while a prayer, a sermon, or a sabbath lasts ? With many the Lord’s Day is the longest day in the week : and therefore they must sleep longer that morning, and go sooner to bed that night than ordinarily they do, that the day may be made of a tolerable length. And still their hearts say, ‘When will the sabbath be gone ?’

“ 3. Consider how the Will of the natural man ‘rebels against the light.’ Sometimes he is not able to keep it out ; but he ‘loves darkness rather than light.’ The outer door of the understanding

is broken open, but the inner door of the will remains shut. Corruption and conscience then encounter ; till conscience is forced to give back : convictions are murdered, and truth is made and *held* prisoner ‘in unrighteousness.’

“ 4. When the Spirit of the Lord is working a deeper work, yet what resistance does the soul make ? When he comes, he finds the ‘strong man keeping the house,’ while the soul is fast asleep in the Devil’s arms ; till the Lord awakens the sinner, opens his eyes, and strikes him with terror, while the clouds are black above his head, and the sword of vengeance is held to his breast. But what pains is he at to put a fair face on a black heart ? To shake off his fears, or make head against them ? Carnal reason suggests, if it be ill with him, it will be ill with many. When he is beat from this, and sees no advantage in going to hell with company, he resolves to leave his sins ; but cannot think of breaking off *so soon*, there is time enough, and he will do it afterwards. When at length he is constrained to part with some sins, others are kept as right-hands or right-eyes. Nay, when he is so pressed, that he must needs say before the Lord, he is willing to part with *all* his idols, yet how long will his heart give the lie to his tongue, and prevent the execution of it ?

“ Thirdly, There is in the Will of man a natural proneness to evil. Men are naturally ‘bent to backsliding from God :’ they *hang* (as the word is) towards backsliding. Leave the unrenewed Will to itself, it will choose sin and reject holiness ; and that as certainly as water poured on the side of a hill will run downward and not upward.

“ 1. Is not the way of evil the *first way* wherein the children of men go ? Do not their inclinations plainly appear on the wrong side, while they have not cunning to hide them ? As soon as it appears we are *reasonable* creatures, it appears we are *sinful* creatures. ‘ Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child, till the rod of correction drives it from him.’ It is *bound* in the heart, woven into our very nature ; nor will the knots loose ; they must be *broke* asunder by strokes. Words will not do ; the rod must be taken to drive it away. Not that the rod of itself will do this : the sad experience of many parents testifies the contrary. And Solomon himself tells you, ‘ Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar, yet will not his foolishness depart from him.’ But the rod is an ordinance of God appointed for that end ; which, like the word, is made effectual by the Spirit’s accompanying his own ordinance.

“ 2. How easily men are led into sin ! Persuaded to evil, though not to good. Those whom the word cannot draw to holiness, Satan leads to wickedness at his pleasure. To learn doing ill, is always easy to the unrenewed man : but to learn to do good, is as difficult as for ‘the Ethiopian to change his skin.’ Were the will evenly poised between good and evil, one might be embraced with as much ease as the other. But experience testifies it is not : yea, the experience of all ages. How often did the Israelites forsake the Almighty God, and doat upon the idols of the nations ? But did ever one of those

nations forsake their idols, and grow fond of the God of Israel ! No, no. Though man is naturally given to change, it is but from evil to evil, not from evil to good. Surely then the will of man stands not in equal balance, but has a cast on the wrong side.

“3. Consider how men go on still in the way of sin, till they meet with a stop from another hand than their own. ‘I hid me, and he went on frowardly in the way of his own heart.’ If God withdraws his restraining hand, man is in no doubt which way to choose. For the way of sin is ‘the way of his heart:’ his heart naturally lies that way. As long as God suffereth them, all nations ‘walk in their own way.’ The natural man is so fixed in evil, that there needs no more to show he is off of God’s way, than to say, he is upon *his own*.

“Fourthly. There is a natural contrariety, a direct opposition in the will of man to God himself. ‘The carnal mind is enmity against God: it is not subject to the law of God, neither can be.’

“I have a charge against every unregenerate man and woman, to be proved by the testimony of Scripture, and their own conscience: namely, that whether they have the form of religion or not, they are *heart-enemies* to God; to the Son of God, to the Spirit of God, and to the law of God. Hear this, all ye careless souls, that live at ease in your natural state.

“1. Ye are *enemies to God in your mind*. Ye are not as yet reconciled to him. The natural enmity is not slain, though perhaps it lies hid, and ye do not perceive it. Every natural man is an enemy to God, as he is revealed in his word; to an infinitely *holy, just, powerful, and true* Being. In effect, men are naturally ‘haters of God:’ and if they could, they would certainly make him *another* than what he is.

“To convince you of this, let me propose a few queries. (1.) How are your hearts affected to the infinite holiness of God? If ye are not ‘partakers of his holiness,’ ye cannot be reconciled to it. The heathens, finding they were not like God in holiness, made their gods like themselves in filthiness; and thereby discovered what sort of a god the natural man would have. God is holy. Can an unholy creature love his unspotted holiness? Nay, it is ‘the righteous’ only that can ‘give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness. God is light: can creatures of darkness, and that walk in darkness, rejoice therein? Nay, ‘every one that doeth evil hateth the light. For what communion hath light with darkness?’ (2.) How are your hearts affected to the justice of God? There is not a man who is wedded to his sins, but would be content with the blood of his body, to blot that letter out of the name of God. Can the malefactor love his condemning judge? Or an unjustified sinner a just God? No, he cannot. And hence, since men cannot get the doctrine of his justice blotted out of the Bible, yet it is such an eye-sore to them, that they strive to blot it out of their minds: they ruin themselves by presuming on his mercy, ‘saying in their heart, the Lord will not do good, neither will he do evil.’ (3.) How are ye affected to the Omniscience and Omnipresence of God? Men na-

turally would rather have a blind idol, than an all-seeing God, and therefore do what they can, as Adam did, to 'hide themselves from the presence of the Lord.' They no more love an Omniscient God, than the thief loves to have the judge witness to his evil deeds. (4.) How are ye affected to the truth of God? How many hope that God will not be true to his word? There are thousands that hear the gospel, and hope to be saved, who never experienced the New Birth, nor do at all concern themselves in that question, whether they are born again or not. Our Lord's words are plain and peremptory, 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' What then are such hopes, but real hopes that God will *recall* his word, and that Christ will prove a false prophet? (5.) How are they affected to the power of God? None but new creatures can love him for it. Every natural man would contribute to the building another Tower of Babel, to hem it in. On these grounds, I declare every unrenewed man *an enemy to God*.

"2. Ye are enemies to the Son of God; that enmity to Christ is in your hearts, which would have made you join the 'husbandmen, who killed the heir, and cast him out of the vineyard.' 'Am I a log,' ye will say, to have so treated my *dear* Saviour? So said Hazaël, in another case. But how did he act? Many call him *dear*; to whom their sins are ten times dearer than their Saviour. He is no otherwise *dear* to them, than as they abuse his death, for the peaceable enjoyment of their sins: that they may live as they list in this world; and when they die be kept out of hell. To convince you of this I will lay before you the enmity of your hearts against Christ in all his offices.

"I. Every unregenerate man is an enemy to Christ in his prophetic office. For evidence of this, consider,

"1. The entertainments he meets with, when he comes to teach souls *inwardly* by his Spirit. Men do what they can to stop their ears, that they may not hear his voice. They 'always resist the Holy Ghost:' they 'desire not the knowledge of his ways.' The old calumny is thrown upon him again, 'He is mad: why hear ye him?' 'The spirit of bondage' is accounted by many mere distraction and melancholy: men thus blaspheming God's work, because they themselves are beside themselves, and cannot judge of those matters.

"2. Consider the entertainment he meets with when he comes to teach men *outwardly* by his word.

"(1.) His written word the Bible, is slighted. Many lay by their Bibles with their Sunday clothes. Alas! The dust about your Bibles is a witness of the enmity of your hearts against Christ as prophet. And of those who read them oftener, how few are there that read them as the word of the Lord to their souls in particular, so as to keep up communion with God therein? Hence they are strangers to the solid comfort of the Scriptures; and if at any time they are dejected, it is something else, and not the word of God, which revives their drooping spirits.

“(2.) Christ’s word preached is despised. Men can without remorse make to themselves one silent sabbath after another. And, alas, when they ‘tread his courts,’ how little reverence and awe of God appear on their spirits ! Many stand as brazen walls before the word, on whom it makes no breach at all. Nay, not a few are growing worse and worse, notwithstanding ‘ precept upon precept.’ What tears of blood are sufficient to lament this ? Remember, we are but the ‘voice of one crying.’ The speaker is in heaven. Yet ye refuse him that speaketh, and prefer the prince of darkness before the Prince of Peace. A dismal darkness overspread the world by Adam’s fall, more terrible than if the sun and moon had been extinguished. And it must have covered us eternally, had not ‘the grace of God appeared’ to dispel it. But we flee from it, and, like the wild beasts, lay ourselves ‘down in our dens.’ Such is the enmity of the hearts of men, against Christ in his prophetic office.

“II. The natural man is an enemy to Christ in his priestly office. He is appointed of the Father ‘a priest for ever,’ that by his sacrifice and intercession alone, sinners may have access to, and peace with God. But ‘Christ crucified’ is ever a stumbling-block and foolishness to the unregenerate part of mankind.

“None of Adam’s children naturally incline to receive the blessing in borrowed robes, but would always climb up to heaven on a thread spun out of their own bowels. They look on God as a great Master, and themselves as his servants, they must work and win heaven as their wages. Hence when conscience awakes, they think that, to be saved, they must answer the demands of the law ; ‘serve God as well as they can,’ and pray for mercy wherein they come short. And thus many come to duties, that never come *out of them* to Christ.

“Indeed the natural man going to God in duties, will continually be found, either to go without a Mediator, or with more mediators than one. Nature is blind, and therefore venturous : it puts men on going immediately to God without Christ. Converse with many hearers of the gospel on their hopes of salvation, and the name of Christ will scarcely be heard from their mouth. Ask them how they think to find the pardon of sin ? They say, they look for mercy, because God is a merciful God : and this is all they have to trust in. Others look for mercy for Christ’s sake. But how do they know Christ will take their plea in hand ? Why they pray, mourn, confess, and have great desires. So they have something of their own to recommend them to him. They were never made ‘poor in spirit,’ and brought empty-handed to God, to lay the stress of all his atoning blood.

“III. The natural man is an enemy to Christ in his kingly office.

“How unwilling are natural men to submit to the laws and discipline of his kingdom ! However they may be brought to some outward submission to the King of Saints, yet sin always retains its throne in their hearts, and they are ‘serving divers lusts and pleasures.’ None but those in whom Christ is formed, do really put th:

crown on his head. None but these receive the kingdom of Christ within them, and set up and put down their souls as he will. As for others, any lord should sooner have the rule over them than the Lord of Glory. They kindly entertain his enemies, and will never absolutely resign themselves to his government. Thus you see, the natural man is an enemy to Jesus Christ and all his offices.

“3. Ye are enemies to the Spirit of God; he is the Spirit of Holiness. The natural man is unholy, and loves to be so: and therefore ‘resists the Holy Ghost.’ The work of the Spirit is to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment.’ But, Oh! how do men strive to ward off these convictions, as they would a blow that threatened their life! If the Spirit dart them in so that they cannot avoid them, does not the heart say, ‘Hast thou found me, O mine enemy? And indeed they treat him as an enemy, doing their utmost to stifle their convictions, and to murder these harbingers that come to prepare the way of the Lord in the soul. Some fill their hands with business, to put convictions out of their head, as Cain who fell to building a city. Some put them off with fair promises, as Felix did; some sport or sleep them away. And how can it be otherwise? For it is the work of the Holy Spirit, to subdue lusts and burn up corruption. How then can he whose lusts are dear as his life, fail of being an enemy to him?

“Lastly, Ye are enemies to the law of God. Though the natural man *desires* to be *under the law*, as a covenant of works, yet as it is a rule of life, he ‘is not subject to it, neither indeed can be.’ For, 1. Every natural man is wedded to some sin, which he cannot part with. And as he cannot bring up his inclinations to the law, he would fain bring down the law to his inclinations. And this is a plain standing evidence of the enmity of his heart against it. 2. The law set home on the awakened conscience in its spirituality, irritates corruption. It is as oil to the fire, which, instead of quenching, makes it flame the more. ‘When the commandment comes, sin revives.’ What reason can be assigned for this, but the natural enmity of the heart against the holy law? We conclude then, that the unregenerate are heart enemies to God, his Son, his Spirit, and his law: that there is a natural contrariety, opposition, and enmity in the will of man, to God himself and his holy will.

“Fifthly. The unrenewed will is wholly perverse, in reference to the end of man. Man is merely a dependent being; having no existence or goodness originally from himself: but all he has is from God, as the first cause and spring of all perfection, natural and moral. Dependence is woven into his very nature; so that should God withdraw from him, he would sink into nothing. Since then whatever man is, he is *of him*, surely whatever he is, he should be *to him*; as the waters which came out of the sea, return thither again. And thus man was created looking directly to God, as his last end: but falling into sin, he fell off from God, and turned into himself. Now this infers a total apostacy and universal corruption in man. For where the last end is changed, there can be no real goodness.

And this is the case of all men in their natural state: they seek not God, but themselves. Hence though many fair shreds of morality are among them, yet ‘there is none that doth good, no, not one.’ For though some of them *run well*, they are still *off the way*; they never aim at the right mark. Whithersoever they move, they cannot move beyond the circle of *self*. They seek *themselves*, they act for *themselves*; their natural, civil, and religious actions, from whatever spring they come, do all run into, and meet in this dead sea.

“Most men are so far from making God their end in their natural and civil actions, that he is not in all their thoughts. They eat and drink for no higher end, than their own pleasure and necessity. Nor do the drops of sweetness God has put into the creatures raise their soul toward that ocean of delights that are in the Creator. And what are the natural man’s civil actions, such as buying, selling, working, but *fruit for himself*? Yea, *self* is the highest end of unregenerate men, even their religious actions. They perform duties for a name; for some worldly interest; or, at best, in order to escape from hell. They seek not God at all, but for their own interest: so that God is only the means, and *self* their end.

“Thus have I given a rude draught of man’s will in his natural state, drawn from Scripture and our own experience. Now since all must be wrong, where the understanding and will are so corrupt, I shall briefly despatch what remains.

“III. The *affections* are corrupted: wholly disordered and distempered. They are like an unruly horse, that either will not receive, or violently runs away with the rider. Man’s heart is naturally a mother of abominations: ‘For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness.’ The natural man’s affections are wholly misplaced; he is a spiritual monster. His heart is, where his *feet* should be, fixed on earth: his heels are lifted up against heaven, which his heart should be set on: his face is towards hell, and his back toward heaven. He loves what he should *hate*, and *hates* what he should *love*; *joys* in what he ought to *mourn* for, and *mourns* for what he should *rejoice* in; *glories* in his *shame*, and is *ashamed* of his *glory*; *abhors* what he should *desire*, and *desires* what he should abhor. If his affections are set on lawful objects, they are either excessive or defective. These objects have either too little of them or too much. But spiritual things have always too little.

“Here is a threefold cord against heaven, not easily broken, a blind mind, a perverse will, disordered affections. The mind swelled with pride, says, the man should not stoop: the will opposite to the will of God, says, he will not: and the corrupt affections, rising against the Lord, in defence of the corrupt will, say, he shall not. And thus we stand out against God, till we are created anew by Christ Jesus.

“IV The conscience is corrupt and defiled. It cannot do its work, but according to the light it hath to work by. Wherefore seeing ‘the natural man discerneth not spiritual things,’ his con-

science is quite useless in that point. It may indeed check for grosser sins, but spiritual sins it discerns not. Thus it will fly in the face of many for drunkenness, who yet have a profound peace though they live in unbelief, and are utter strangers to *spiritual worship* and the *life of faith*. And the light of his conscience being faint and languishing, even in the things which it does reach, its incitements to duty, and struggles against sin are very remiss and easily got over. But there is also a false light in the dark mind, which often ‘calls evil good and good evil.’ And such a conscience is like a blind and furious horse, which violently runs down all that comes in his way. Indeed whenever conscience is awakened by the Spirit of Conviction, it will rage and roar, and put the whole man in a consternation. It makes the stiff heart to tremble, and the knees to bow ; sets the eyes a weeping, the tongue a confessing. But still it is an evil conscience, which naturally leads only to despair : and will do it effectually, unless either sin prevail over it to lull it asleep, as in the case of Felix : or the blood of Christ prevail over it, ‘sprinkling and purging it from dead works.’

“ Thus is man by nature wholly corrupted. But whence came this total corruption of our nature ? That man’s nature was corrupt the very Heathens perceived : but how *sin entered* they could not tell. But the Scripture is very plain in the point. ‘By one man sin entered into the world.’ ‘By one man’s disobedience many (*all*) were made sinners.’ Adam’s sin corrupted man’s nature, and leavened the whole lump of mankind. We putrefied in Adam as our root. The root was poisoned, and so the branches were envenomed. The vine turned ‘the vine of Sodom,’ and so the grapes became ‘grapes of gall.’ Adam by his sin became not only *guilty*, but *corrupt*, and so transmits guilt and corruption to his posterity. By his sin he stripped himself of his original righteousness and corrupted himself. We were in him *representatively*, as our moral head : we were in him *seminally*, as our natural head. Hence we fell in *him* : (as Levi ‘paid tithes when in the loins of Abraham.’) ‘By his disobedience we were made sinners :’ his first sin is imputed to us. And we are left without that original righteousness, which being given to him as a common person, he cast off. And this is necessarily followed in him and us, by the corruption of our whole nature : righteousness and corruption being two contraries, one of which must always be in man. And Adam our common father being corrupt, so are we : for ‘who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ?’

“ It remains only to apply this doctrine. And, first, for information. Is man’s nature wholly corrupted ? Then, 1. No wonder the grave opens its devouring mouth for us as soon as the womb has cast us forth. For we are all in a spiritual sense dead-born : yea, and *filthy*, (Psalm xiv. 3,) noisome, rank, and stinking, as a *corrupt* thing : (so the word imports.) Let us not complain of the miseries we are exposed to at our entrance, or during our continuance in the world. Here is the venom that has poisoned all the springs of

earthly enjoyments. It is the corruption of human nature, which brings forth all the miseries of life.

2. "Behold here as in a glass, the spring of all the wickedness, profaneness, and formality in the world. Every thing acts agreeably to its own nature ; and so corrupt man acts corruptly. You need not wonder at the sinfulness of your own heart and life, nor at the sinfulness and perverseness of others. If a man be crooked, he cannot but halt ; and if the clock be set wrong, how can it point the hour right ?

" 3. See here why sin is so pleasant, and religion such a burden to men : sin is natural : holiness not so. Oxen cannot feed in the sea, nor fishes in the fruitful field. A swine brought into a palace would prefer the mire. And corrupt nature tends ever to impurity.

" 4. Learn from hence the nature and necessity of regeneration. First, the nature : it is not a *partial* but a *total* change. Thy whole nature is corrupted. Therefore the whole must be renewed. *All things must become new.* If a man who had received many wounds, were cured of all but one, he might still bleed to death. It is not a change made by human industry, but by the Almighty Spirit of God. A man must be 'born of the Spirit.' Our nature is corrupt, and none but the God of nature can change it. Man may pin a new life to an old heart, but he can never change the heart. Secondly, the Necessity : it is absolutely necessary in order to salvation. 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' No unclean thing can enter the *New Jerusalem* : but thou art by nature wholly unclean. Deceive not thyself : no mercy of God, no blood of Christ, will bring an unregenerate sinner to heaven. For God will never open a fountain of mercy to wash away his own holiness and truth : nor did Christ shed his precious blood to blot out the truths of God. *Heaven !* What would you do there, who are not born again ? A *holy* head, and *corrupt* members ! A head full of treasures of grace, members filled with treasures of wickedness ! Ye are no ways adapted to the society above, more than beasts to converse with men. Could the unrenewed man go to heaven, he would go to it no otherwise than now he comes to the dutics of holiness, that is, leaving his heart behind him.

" We may apply this doctrine, secondly, for *lamentation*. Well may we lament thy case, O natural man, for it is the saddest case one can be in out of hell. It is time to lament for thee ; for thou art dead already, dead while thou livest. Thou carriest about a dead soul in a living body ; and because thou art dead, canst not lament thy own case. Thou hast *no good in thee* : thy soul is a mass of darkness, rebellion, and vileness, before God. Thou canst do no good : thou canst do nothing but sin. For thou art 'the servant of sin,' and therefore *free* from *righteousness* : thou dost not, canst not meddle with it. Thou art 'under the dominion of sin,' a dominion where righteousness can have no place. Thou art a child and a servant of the Devil, as long as thou art in a state of nature. But to prevent any mistake, consider that Satan hath two kinds of ser-

vants. There are some employed, as it were, in coarser work. These bear the Devil's mark in their *foreheads*, having no form of godliness, not so much as performing the external duties of religion, but living apparently as sons of earth, only minding earthly things. Whereas others are employed in more refined work, who carry his mark in their *right-hand*, which they can and do hide by a form of religion, from the view of the world. These sacrifice to the corrupt mind, as the other to the flesh. Pride, unbelief, self-pleasing, and the like spiritual sins, prey on their corrupted, wholly corrupted souls. Both are servants of the same house, equally void of righteousness.

“Indeed how is it possible thou shouldst be able to do any thing good, whose nature is wholly corrupt? ‘Can an evil tree bring forth good fruit?’ ‘Do men gather grapes of thorns?’ If then thy nature be totally evil, all thou dost is certainly so too.

“Hear, O sinner, what is thy case; innumerable sins compass thee about: floods of impurities overwhelm thee. Sins of all sorts roll up and down in the dead sea of thy soul; where no good can breathe, because of the corruption there. Thy lips are unclean: the opening of thy mouth is as the opening of a grave, full of stench and rottenness. Thy natural actions are sin: for ‘when ye did eat, and when ye did drink, did not ye eat for yourselves and drink for yourselves?’ (Zech. vii. 6.) Thy civil actions are sin. Prov. xxi. 4. ‘The ploughing of the wicked is sin.’ Thy religious actions are sin, ‘The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord.’ The thoughts and imaginations of thy heart are ‘only evil continually.’ A deed may be soon done, a word soon spoken, a thought pass; but each of these is an item in thy accounts. O sad reckoning! As many thoughts, words, actions, so many more sins: and the longer thou livest, thy accounts swell the more. Should a tear be dropped for every sin, thine eyes must be ‘fountains of tears.’ For nothing but sin comes from thee: thy heart frames nothing but evil imaginations: there is nothing in thy life, but what is framed by thy heart: therefore there is nothing in thy heart or life but evil.

“And all thy religion, if thou hast any, is lost labour, if thou art not born again; truly then thy duties are sins. Would not the best wine be loathsome in a foul vessel? So is the religion of an unregenerate man. Thy duties cannot make thy corrupt soul holy; but thy corrupt heart makes them unclean. Thou was wont to divide thy works into two sorts; to count some good, and some evil. But thou must count again, and put all under one head; for God writes on them all, *Only evil*.

“And thou canst not help thyself. What canst thou do to take away thy sin, who art wholly corrupt? Will mud and filth wash our filthiness? And wilt thou purge out sin by sinning? Job took a potsherd to scrape himself, because his hands were as full of boils as his body. This is the case of thy corrupt soul, so long as thou art in a state of nature. Thou art poor indeed, extremely *miserable and poor*: thou hast no shelter but a refuge of lies: no garment for thy

soul but *filthy rags*; nothing to nourish it but husks that cannot satisfy. More than that, thou hast got such a bruise in the loins of Adam, that thou art *without strength*, unable to do any thing. Nay, more than all this, thou canst not so much as seek aright, but liest helpless, as an infant exposed in the open field.

“ O that ye would believe this sad truth. How little is it believed in the world ! Few are concerned to have their evil lives reformed ; but fewer far, to have their evil nature changed. Most men know not what they are ; as the eye, which seeing many things, never sees itself. But until ye know every one the ‘ plague of his own heart,’ there is no hope of your recovery. Why will ye not believe the plain testimony of Scripture ? Alas ! That is the nature of your disease. ‘ Thou knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.’ Lord, open their eyes, before they lift them up in hell, and see what they will not see now !

“ Meantime let us have a special eye upon the corruption and sin of our nature. What avails it to take notice of other sins, while this mother sin is unnoticed ? This is a weighty point ; in speaking to which I shall,

“ 1. Point at some evidences of men’s overlooking the sin of their nature. As (1.) men’s being so confident of themselves, as if they were in no danger of gross sins. Many would take heinously such a caution as Christ gave his apostles, ‘ Take heed of surfeiting and drunkenness.’ They would be ready to cry out, Am I a dog ? It would raise the pride of their hearts, not their fear and trembling. And all this is a proof, that they know not the corruption of their own nature. (2.) Untenderness toward them that fall. Many in this case cast off all bowels of compassion : a plain proof that they do not know or ‘ consider themselves, lest they also be tempted.’ Grace indeed does make men zealous against sin, in others as well as in themselves. But eyes turned inward to the corruption of nature, clothe them with pity and compassion, and fill them with thankfulness, that they were not the persons left to be such spectacles of human frailty. (3.) Men’s venturing so boldly on temptation, in confidence of their coming off fairly. Were they sensible of the corruption of their nature, they would beware of entering on the Devil’s ground ; as one girt about with bags of gunpowder, would be loth to walk where sparks of fire were flying.

“ 2. I shall mention a few things, in which ye should have a special eye to the sin of your nature. (1.) In your application to Christ. When you are with the Physician, O forget not this disease. They never yet knew their errand to Christ, who went not to him for the sin of their nature ; for his blood to take away the guilt, and his Spirit to break the power of it. Though ye should lay before him a catalogue of sins, which might reach from earth to heaven, yet if you omit this, you have forgot the best part of the errand a poor sinner has to the Physician of souls. (2.) Have a special eye to it in your repentance. If you would repent indeed, let the streams lead you up to the fountain, and mourn over your corrupt nature, as

the cause of all sin, in heart, word, and work. ‘Against thee, thec only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight. Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.’ (3.) Have a special eye to it in your mortification. ‘Crucify the flesh with its affections and desires.’ It is the root of bitterness which must be struck at; else we labour in vain. In vain do we go about to purge the streams, if we are at no pains about the muddy fountain. (4.) Ye are to eye this in your daily walk. He that would walk uprightly, must have one eye *upward* to Jesus Christ, another *inward* to the corruption of his own nature.

“ III. I shall offer some reasons, why we should especially observe the sin of our nature. 1. Because of all sins it is the most extensive and diffusive. It goes through the whole man and spoils all. Other sins mar particular parts of the image of God; but this defaces the whole. It is the poison of the old serpent cast into the fountain, and so infects every action, every breathing of the soul.

“ 2. It is the cause of all particular sins, both in our hearts and lives. ‘Out of the heart of man proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, and all other abominations. It is the bitter fountain, and particular lusts are but rivulets running from it, which bring forth into the life a part only, not the whole of what is within.

“ 3. It is virtually *all* sins; for it is the seed of all, which want but the occasion to set up their heads. Hence it is called ‘a body of death,’ as consisting of the several members which constitute that ‘body of sins,’ (Col. ii. 11,) whose life lies in spiritual death. It is the cursed ground, fit to bring forth all manner of noxious weeds. Never did *every* sin appear in the conversation of the vilest wretch that ever lived. But look into thy nature, and thou mayest see *all* and *every* sin in the root thereof. There is a fulness of all unrighteousness there: atheism, idolatry, adultery, murder. Perhaps none of these *appear* to thee in thy heart: but there is more in that unfathomable depth of wickedness than thou knowest.

“ 4. The sin of our nature is of all sins the most *fixed* and *abiding*. Sinful actions are transient, though the guilt and stain of them may remain. But the corruption of nature passes not away. It remains in its full power, by night and by day, at all times, till nature is changed by converting grace.

“ You may observe three things in the corrupt heart. (1.) There is the *corrupt nature*, the evil *bent* of the heart, whereby men are unapt for all good, and fitted for all evil. (2.) There are particular lusts or dispositions of that corrupt nature, such as pride, passion, covetousness. (3.) There is one of these stronger than all the rest, ‘The sin which doth so easily beset us.’ So that the river divides into many streams, whereof one is greater than the rest. The corruption of nature is the river-head, which has many particular lusts wherein it runs; but it mainly disburdens itself into that which we call the *predominant sin*. But as in some rivers the main stream runs not always in the same channel, so the besetting sin may change, as lust in youth may be succeeded by covetousness in old age. Now what

does it avail, to reform in other things, while the reigning sin retains its full power ? What if a particular sin be gone ? If the sin of our nature keep the throne, it will set up another in its stead : as when a water-course is stopped in one place, it will break forth in another. Thus some cast off their prodigality ; but covetousness comes in its stead. Some quit their profaneness ; but the same stream runs in the other channel of self-righteousness.

“ That you may have a full view of the sin of your nature, I would recommend to you three things: (1.) Study to know the spirituality and extent of the law of God ; for that is the glass wherein you may see yourselves. (2.) Observe your hearts at all times ; but especially under temptation. Temptation is a fire that brings up the scum of the unregenerate heart. (3.) Go to God through Jesus Christ, for illumination by his Spirit. Say unto him, ‘ What I know not, teach thou me : ’ and be willing to take in light from the word. It is by the word the Spirit teacheth ; but unless he teach, all other teaching is to little purpose. You will never see yourself aright, till he light his candle in your breast. Neither the fulness and glory of Christ, nor the corruption and vileness of our nature, ever were or can be rightly learned, but where the Spirit of Christ is the teacher.

“ To conclude. Let the consideration of what has been said, commend Christ to you all. Ye that are brought out of your natural state, be humble : still coming to Christ, still cleaving to him, for the purging out what remains of your natural corruption. Ye that are yet in your natural state, what will ye do ? Ye must die : ye must stand at the judgment seat of God. Will you lie down and sleep another night at ease in this case ? See, ye do it not. Before another day you may be set before his dreadful tribunal, in the grave-clothes of your corrupt state, and your vile souls cast into the pit of destruction, to be for ever buried out of God’s sight. For I testify unto you, there is no peace with God, no pardon, no heaven for you in this state. There is but a step betwixt you and eternal destruction from the presence of the Lord. If the brittle thread of life, which may be broken with a touch, in a moment, or ever you are aware, be broken while you are in this state, you are ruined for ever, and without remedy. But come ye speedily to Jesus Christ. He hath cleansed as vile souls as yours. ‘ Confess your sins ; ’ and he will both ‘ forgive your sins, and cleanse you from all unrighteousness.’

BRISTOL, Aug. 17, 1757.

P R E D E S T I N A T I O N

C A L M L Y C O N S I D E R E D.

“That to the height of this great Argument,
I may assert Eternal Providence,
And justify the Ways of God to Men.”

MILTON.

I. I AM inclined to believe, that many of those who enjoy the faith which worketh by love, may remember some time when the power of the Highest wrought upon them in an eminent manner ; when the voice of the Lord laid the mountains low, brake all the rocks in pieces, and mightily shed abroad his love in their hearts, by the Holy Ghost given unto them. And at that time it is certain, they had no power to *resist* the grace of God. They were then no more able to stop the course of that torrent, which carried all before it, than to stem the waves of the sea with their hand, or to stay the sun in the midst of heaven.

II. And the children of God may continually observe, how his love leads them on from faith to faith ; with what tenderness he watches over their souls ; with what care he brings them back if they go astray, and then upholds their going in his path, that their footsteps may not slide. They cannot but observe how unwilling he is to let them go from serving him ; and how, notwithstanding the stubbornness of their wills, and the wildness of their passions, he goes on in his work, conquering and to conquer, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet.

III. The farther this work is carried on in their hearts, the more earnestly do they cry out, “ Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name give the praise, for thy mercy and for thy truth’s sake.” The more deeply are they convinced that, by grace we are saved ; not of works, lest any man should boast ; that we are not pardoned and accepted with God for the sake of any thing we have done, but wholly and solely for the sake of Christ, of what he hath done and suffered for us. The more assuredly likewise do they know, that the condition of this acceptance is faith alone ; before which gift of God no good work can be done, none which hath not in it the nature of sin.

IV How *easily* then may a believer infer, from what he hath experienced in his own soul, that the true grace of God *always* works *irresistibly* in every believer ? That God will finish wherever he has begun this work, so that it is impossible for any believer to *fall from grace* ? And, lastly, that the reason why God gives this, to some only, and not to others, is, because of his own will, without any previous

regard either to their faith or works, he hath *absolutely, unconditionally predestinated* them to life, before the foundation of the world.

V. Agreeable hereto, in the Protestant Confession of Faith, drawn up at Paris, in the year 1559, we have these words: (Article 12.)

“We believe, that out of the general corruption and condemnation, in which all men are plunged, God draws those whom in his eternal and unalterable counsel, he has elected by his own goodness and mercy, through our Lord Jesus Christ, without considering their works, leaving the others in the same corruption and condemnation.”

VI. To the same effect speak the Dutch Divines assembled at Dort, in the year 1618. Their words are: (Art. 6. *et seq.*)

“Whereas, in process of time, God bestowed faith on some, and not on others, this proceeds from his eternal Decree—According to which, he softens the hearts of the elect, and leaveth them that are not elect in their wickedness and hardness.

“And herein is discovered the difference put between men equally lost: that is to say, the decree of election and reprobation.

“Election is the unchangeable decree of God, by which, before the foundation of the world, he hath chosen, in Christ unto salvation, a set number of men. This election is one and the same of all which are to be saved.

“Not all men are elected, but some not elected; whom God, in his unchangeable good pleasure, hath decreed, to leave in the common misery, and not to bestow saving faith upon them; but leaving them in their own ways, at last to condemn and punish them everlasting for their unbelief, and also for their other sins. And this is the Decree of Reprobation.”

VII. Likewise in the Confession of Faith, set forth by the Assembly of English and Scotch divines, in the year 1646, are these words: (chap 3.)

“God from all eternity did unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass.

“By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death.

“These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

“Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God before the foundation of the world, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, without any foresight of faith or good works.

“The rest of mankind God was pleased, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dis honour and wrath.”

No less express are Mr. Calvin’s words in his *Christian Institutions*, (chap. 21, sect. 1.)

“All men are not created for the same end: but some are fore-ordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation. So according as every man was created for the one or the other, we say he was *elect*—

ed, i. e. predestinated to life ; or *reprobated, i: e.* predestinated to damnation."

VIII. Indeed there are some who assert the decree of election, and not the decree of reprobation. They assert that God hath, by a positive unconditional decree, chosen some to life and salvation : but not that he hath, by any such decree, devoted the rest of mankind to destruction. These are they to whom I would address myself first. And let me beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, to lift up your hearts to him, and to beg of him to free you from all pre-possession, from the prejudices even of your tender years, and from whatsoever might hinder the light of God from shining in upon your souls. Let us calmly and fairly weigh these things, in the balance of the sanctuary. And let all be done in love and meekness of wisdom, as becomes those who are fighting under one Captain, and who humbly hope they are joint heirs through him of the glory which shall be revealed.

I am verily persuaded, that in the uprightness of your hearts, you defend the decree of unconditional election ; even in the same uprightness wherein you object and abhor that of unconditional reprobation. But consider, I entreat you, whether you are consistent with yourselves : consider whether this election can be separate from reprobation ; whether one of them does not imply the other, so that in holding one you must hold both.

IX. That this was the judgment of those who had the most deeply considered the nature of these decrees, of the Assembly of English and Scotch divines, of the reformed churches, both in France and the Low Countries, and of Mr. Calvin himself, appears from their own words, beyond all possibility of contradiction. "Out of the general corruption (saith the French church) he draws those whom he hath elected ; leaving the others in the same corruption, according to his immovable decree." "By the decree of God, (says the Assembly of English and Scotch divines,) some are predestinated unto everlasting life, others fore-ordained to everlasting death." "God hath, once for all, (saith Mr. Calvin,) appointed, by an eternal and unchangeable decree, to whom he would give salvation, and whom he would devote to destruction." (*Inst. cap. 3. sect. 7.*) Nay, it is observable, Mr. Calvin speaks with utter contempt and disdain of all who endeavour to separate one from the other, who assert election without reprobation. "Many, (says he,) as it were to excuse God, own election, and deny reprobation. But this is quite silly and childish. For election cannot stand without reprobation. Whom God passes by, those he reprobates. It is one and the same thing." (*Inst. 1. 3, cap. 23, sect. 1.*)

X. Perhaps, upon deeper consideration, you will find yourself of the same judgment. It may be, you also hold reprobation, though you know it not. Do not you believe, that God, who made *one vessel unto honour*, hath made another *unto eternal dishonour*? Do not you believe that the men who "turn the grace of our God into lasciviousness, were before ordained of God unto this condemnation?"

Do not you think, that for this same purpose God raised Pharaoh up, that he might show his sovereign power in his destruction ? And that Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated, refers to their eternal state ? Why then, you hold absolute reprobation ; and you think Esau and Pharaoh were instances of it ; as well as all those vessels made unto dishonour, those men before ordained unto condemnation ?

XI. To set this matter in a still clearer light, you need only answer one question. Is any man saved who is not elected ? Is it possible that any man not elected should be saved ? If you say, No, you put an end to the doubt : You espouse election and reprobation together. You confirm Mr. Calvin's words, that "without reprobation, election itself cannot stand." You allow, though you were not sensible of it before, that "whom God elects not, them he reprobates."

Try whether it be possible, in any particular case, to separate election from reprobation. Take one of those who are supposed not to be elected ; one whom God hath not chosen unto life and salvation. Can this man be saved from sin and hell ? You answer, "No." Why not ? "Because he is not elected. Because God hath unchangeably decreed to save so many souls, and no more ; and he is not of that number. Him God hath decreed to pass by ; to leave him to everlasting destruction : in consequence of which irresistible decree, the man perishes everlasting." O my brethren, how small is the difference between this and a broad, barefaced reprobation !

XII. Let me entreat you to make this case your own. In the midst of life, you are in death ; your soul is dead while you live, if you live in sin, if you do not live to God. And who can deliver you from the body of this death ? Only the grace of God in Jesus Christ our Lord. But God hath decreed to give this grace, to others only, and not to you : to leave *you* in unbelief and spiritual death, and for that unbelief to punish you with death everlasting. Well then mayest thou cry, even till thy throat is dry, "O wretched man that I am !" For an unchangeable, irresistible decree standeth between thee and the very possibility of salvation. Go now, and find out how to split the hair between thy being reprobated, and not elected ; how to separate reprobation, in its most effectual sense, from unconditional election !

XIII. Acknowledge then, that you hold reprobation. Avow it in the face of the sun. To be consistent with yourself, you must openly assert, that "without reprobation this election cannot stand." You know it cannot. You know if God hath fixed a decree that *these men only* shall be saved, in such a decree it is manifestly implied, that *all other men* shall be damned. If God hath decreed, that *this part* of mankind and no more, shall live eternally, you cannot but see it is therein decreed, "that the other part shall never see life." O let us deal ingenuously with each other. What we really hold, let us openly profess. And if reprobation be the truth, it will bear the light ; for "the word of our God shall stand for ever."

XIV. Now, then, without any extenuation on the one hand, or exaggeration on the other, let us look upon this doctrine, call it what you please, naked and in its native colour. Before the foundations of the world were laid, God, of his own mere will and pleasure, fixed a decree concerning all the children of men, who should be born unto the end of the world. This decree was unchangeable with regard to God, and irresistible with regard to man. And herein it was ordained that one part of mankind should be saved from sin and hell, and all the rest left to perish for ever and ever, without help, without hope. That none of these should have that grace, which alone could prevent their dwelling with everlasting burnings, God decreed, for this cause alone, "because it was his good pleasure!" and for this end, "to show forth his glorious power, and his sovereignty over all the earth."

XV. Now can you, upon reflection, believe this? Perhaps you will say, "I do not think about it." That will never do. You not only think about it, (though it may be confusedly,) but speak about it too, whenever you speak of unconditional election. You do not think about it! What do you mean? Do you never think about *Esau* or *Pharaoh*? Or in general about a *certain number* of souls, whom *alone* God hath decreed to save? Why in that very thought reprobation lurks; it entered your heart the moment that entered. It stays as long as that stays. And you cannot speak that thought, without speaking of reprobation. True, it is covered with fig-leaves, so that a heedless eye may not observe it to be there. But if you narrowly observe, unconditional election cannot appear without the cloven foot of reprobation.

XVI. "But do not the Scriptures speak of *election*? They say, St. Paul was 'an *elected* or chosen vessel.' Nay, and speak of great numbers of men, as '*elect*', according to the fore-knowledge of God.' You cannot therefore deny there is such a thing as *election*. And if there is, what do you mean by it?"

I will tell you in all plainness and simplicity. I believe it commonly means one of these two things; first, a divine appointment of some particular men, to do some particular work in the world. And this election I believe to be not only personal, but absolute and unconditional. Thus Cyrus was *elected* to rebuild the temple, and St. Paul, with the twelve, to preach the gospel. But I do not find this to have any necessary connexion with eternal happiness. Nay it is plain it has not; for one who is *elected* in this sense, may yet be lost eternally. "Have I not chosen (*elected*) you twelve," saith our Lord, "yet one of you hath a Devil?" Judas, you see, was *elected* as well as the rest: yet is his lot with the Devil and his angels.

XVII. I believe *election* means, secondly, a divine appointment of some men to eternal happiness. But I believe this election to be conditional, as well as the reprobation opposite thereto. I believe the eternal decree concerning both is expressed in these words, "He that believeth shall be saved: he that believeth not shall be damned." And this decree without doubt God will not change, and

man cannot resist. According to this, all true *believers* are in Scripture termed *elect*: and all who continue in *unbelief*, are so long properly *reprobates*, that is, *unapproved* of God, and *without discernment* touching the things of the Spirit.

XVIII. Now God, to whom all things are present at once, who sees all eternity at one view, “ calleth the things that are not, as though they were,” the things that are not yet, as though they were now subsisting. Thus he calls Abraham “ the father of many nations” before even Isaac was born. And thus Christ is called, “ the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” though he was not slain, in fact, till some thousands of years after. In like manner, God calleth true believers, “ elect from the foundation of the world:” although they were not actually elect or believers till many ages after, in their several generations. Then only it was that they were actually elected, when they were made the “ sons of God by faith.” Then were they in fact chosen and taken out of the world; “ elect” (saith St. Paul) “ through belief of the truth:” or (as St. Peter expresses it) “ elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit.”

XIX. This election I as firmly believe, as I believe the Scripture to be of God. But unconditional election I cannot believe; not only because I cannot find in Scripture, but also, (to waive all other considerations,) because it necessarily implies unconditional reprobation. Find out any election which does not imply reprobation, and I will gladly agree to it. But reprobation I can never agree to, while I believe the Scripture to be of God: as being utterly irreconcileable to the whole scope of the Old and New Testament.

O that God would give me the desire of my heart! That he would grant me the thing which I long for! Even that your mind might now be free and calm, and open to the light of his Spirit! That you would impartially consider, how it is possible to reconcile reprobation with the following scriptures:

Gen. ii. 7, “ Because thou hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.” The curse shall come on thee and thine offspring, not because of any absolute decree of mine, but because of thy sin.

Chap. iv. 7, “ If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.” Sin only, not the decree of reprobation, hinders thy being accepted.

Deut. vii. 9, “ Know that the Lord thy God, he is the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments, to a thousand generations: and repayeth them that hate him to their face to destroy them.” Ver. 12, “ Wherefore if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep and do them, the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant which he sware unto thy fathers.”

Chap. xi. 26—28, “ Behold, I set before you this day a blessing

and a curse ; a blessing, if you obey the commandments of the Lord your God ; and a curse, if you will not obey."

Chap. xxx. 15, &c. " See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil : in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways and keep his commandments, and the Lord thy God shall bless thee. But if thou wilt not hear, I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish. I call heaven and earth to record this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."

2 Chron. xv. 1, &c. " And the Spirit of God came upon Azariah, and he said,—The Lord is with you while ye be with him : and if ye seek him, he will be found of you : but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you."

Ezra ix. 14, " After all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass,—Should we again break thy commandments, wouldest thou not be angry with us, till thou hadst consumed us ?"

Job xxxvi. 5, " Behold, God is mighty, and despiseth not any." Could he then reprobate any ?

Psal. cxlv. 9, " The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works."

Prov. i. 23, &c. " Turn you at my reproof ; behold I will pour out my Spirit upon you." " Because I have called and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded. I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer ; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me." Why ? Because of my decree ? No. " But because they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord."

Isaiah lxv. 2, &c. " I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people ; a people that provoked me to anger continually to my face ; therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom.—Ye shall all bow down to the slaughter, because when I called ye did not answer,—Therefore ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen ; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name."

Ezek. xviii. 20, &c. " The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear (eternally) the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son.—Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die, saith the Lord : and not that he should return from his ways and live ?"

Matt. vii. 26, " Every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand." Nay, he could not help it, if he were ordained thereto.

Chap. xi. 20, &c. " Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not. Wo unto thee, Chorazin, wo unto thee, Bethsaida : for if the mighty

works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." (What if they were not *elected*? And if they of Bethsaida had been *elected*, would they not have repented too?) "Therefore I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell. For if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee."

Chap. xii. 41, "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas, and behold a greater than Jonas is here." But what was this to the purpose, if *the men of Nineveh* were elected, and *this generation of men* were not?

Chap. xiii. 11, 12, "It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but unto them it is not given. For whosoever hath (i. e. uses what he hath) to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance. But whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." Chap. xxii. 5. 8, "They which were called were not worthy," were shut out from the marriage of the Lamb: Why so? Because "they would not come," verse 3. The whole twenty-fifth chapter requires, and will reward your most serious consideration. If you can reconcile unconditional reprobation with this, you may reconcile it with the 18th of Ezekiel.

John iii. 18, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men love (or choose) darkness rather than light." Chap. v. 44, "How can ye believe, who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh of God only?" Observe the reason why they *could* not believe: it was not in God, but in themselves.

Acts viii. 20, &c. "Thy money perish with thee, (and so doubtless it did.) Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee." So that St. Peter had no thought of any absolute reprobation, even in the case of Simon Magus.

Rom. i. 20, &c. "They are without excuse; because when they knew God, they glorified him not as God:—wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness,—who changed the truth of God into a lie,—For this cause God gave them up to vile affections,—As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient."

2 Thess. ii. 10, &c. "Them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusions, to believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

XX. How will you reconcile reprobation with the following scriptures, which declare God's willingness that all should be saved?

Matt. xxii. 9, "As many as ye shall find, bid (*invite*) to the marriage."

Mark xvi. 15, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every nation."

Luke xix. 41, &c. "And when he came near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If (*rather, O that*) thou hadst known, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace!"

John v. 34, "These things I say, that ye may be saved," viz. those who persecuted him, and sought to slay him, ver. 16; and of whom he complains, ver. 40, "Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life."

Acts xvii. 24, &c. "God, that made the world and all things therein,—giveth to all life, and breath, and all things, and hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth,—That they should seek the Lord." Observe, this was God's end in creating all nations on all the earth.

Rom. v. 18, "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Chap. x. 12, "The same Lord over all, is rich (in mercy) unto all that call upon him."

1 Tim. ii. 3, 4, "This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who willeth all men to be saved:"—Chap. iv. 10, "Who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe," i. e. intentionally of all; and actually of believers. James i. 5, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not." 2 Pet. iii. 9, "The Lord is long-suffering toward us, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 1 John iv. 14, "We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world."

XXI. How will you reconcile reprobation with the following scriptures, which declare that Christ came to save all men, that he died for all, that he atoned for all, even for those that finally perish?

Matt. xviii. 11, "The Son of man is come to save that which is lost," without any restriction. John i. 29, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Chap. iii. 17, "God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved." Chap. xii. 47, "I came not (now) to judge the world, but to save the world." Rom. xiv. 15, "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." 1 Cor. viii. 11, "Through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died."

2 Cor. v. 14, &c. "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all, that those (or all) who live should live unto him which died for them." Here you see, not only that Christ died for all men, but likewise the end of his dying for them.

1 Tim. ii. 6, "Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all."

Heb. ii. 9, "We see Jesus made lower than the angels, that he might taste death for every man."

2 Pet. ii. 1, "There shall be false teachers among you, who shall privately bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." You see, he bought, or redeemed, even those that perish, that bring upon themselves swift destruction.

1 John ii. 1, 2, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins," (who are elect, according to the knowledge of God,) "and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

You are sensible these are but a very small part of the scriptures which might be brought on each of these heads. But they are enough: and they require no comment: taken in their plain, easy, obvious sense, they abundantly prove, that there is not, cannot be any such thing as unconditional reprobation.

XXII. But to be a little more particular. How can you possibly reconcile reprobation with those scriptures that declare the justice of God? To cite one for all:

Ezek. xviii. 2, &c. "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb,—The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine;" (and however I may *temporally* visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, yet this visitation extends no farther) "but the soul that sinneth, it shall die," for its own sin, and not another's. "But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right,—he shall surely live, saith the Lord God. If he beget a son which is a robber,—shall he then live? He shall not live; he shall surely die.—Yet say ye, Why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? Temporally he doth, as in the case of Achan, Korah, and a thousand others. (But not eternally.) "When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth it shall die;" (shall die the second death.) "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. Yet ye say the way of the Lord is not equal. Hear me now, O house of Israel. is not my way equal, (equitable, just?) Are not your ways unequal? When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done, shall he die. Again; when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, saith the Lord God. Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin."

Through this whole passage God is pleased to appeal to man him-

self, touching the justice of his proceedings. And well might he appeal to our own consciences, according to the account of them which is here given. But it is an account which all the art of man will never reconcile with unconditional reprobation.

XXIII. Do you think it will cut the knot to say, "Why, if God might justly have passed by all men," (speak out, "if God might justly have *reprobated* all men," for it comes to the same point,) "then he may justly pass by some. But God might *justly* have passed by all men." Are you sure he might? Where is it written? I cannot find it in the word of God. Therefore I reject it as a bold, precarious assertion, utterly unsupported by holy Scripture.

If you say, "But you know in your own conscience, God might justly have passed by *you* ; I deny it. That God might *justly*, for my unfaithfulness to his grace, *have given me up* long ago, I grant ; but this concession supposes me to have had that grace which you say a reprobate never had.

But besides, in making this supposition of what God might have justly done, you suppose his justice might have been separate from his other attributes, from his mercy in particular. But this never was, nor ever will be ; nor indeed is it possible it should. All his attributes are inseparably joined ; they cannot be divided, no, not for a moment. Therefore this whole argument stands, not only on an unscriptural, but on an absurd, impossible supposition.

XXIV. Do you say, "Nay, but it is just for God to pass by whom he will, because of his sovereignty ;" for he said himself, "May not I do what I will with my own ?" And "Hath not the potter power over his own clay ?" I answer, the former of these sentences stands in the conclusion of that parable, (Matt. xx.) wherein our Lord reproves the Jews for murmuring at God's giving the same reward to the Gentiles as to them. To one of these murmurers it is that God says, "Friend, I do thee no wrong. Take that is thine, and go thy way. I will give unto this last even as unto thee." Then follows, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own ? Is thine eye evil because I am good ?" As if he had said, May I not give my own kingdom to whom I please ? Art thou angry because I am merciful ? It is then undeniably clear, that God does not here assert a right of reprobating any man. Here is nothing spoken of reprobation, bad or good. Here is no kind of reference thereto. This text therefore has nothing to do with the conclusion it was brought to prove.

XXV. But you add, "Hath not the potter power over his own clay ?" Let us consider the context of these words also. They are found in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans ; an *epistle*, the general scope and intent of which is, to publish the eternal, unchangeable, *πρόθεστις*, purpose or decree of God, "He that believeth shall be saved ; he that believeth not shall be damned." The justice of God in condemning those that believed not, and the necessity of believing in order to salvation, the Apostle proves at large in the three first chapters, which he confirms in the

fourth by the example of Abraham. In the former part of the fifth, and in the sixth chapter, he describes the happiness and holiness of true believers. (The latter part of the fifth is a digression, concerning the extent of the benefits flowing from the death of Christ.) In the seventh, he shows in what sense believers in Christ are delivered from the law ; and describes the miserable bondage of those who are still under the law ; that is, who are truly convinced of sin, but not able to conquer it. In the eighth, he again describes the happy liberty of those who truly believe in Christ ; and encourages them to suffer for the faith, as by other considerations, so by this in particular, “ we know that all things work together for good to them that love God,” (ver. 28,) “ to them that are called” (by the preaching of his word) “ according to his purpose,” (or decree which he unalterably fixed from eternity,) he that believeth shall be saved. “ For whom he did foreknow,” (as believing,) “ he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called,” (by his word, so that term is usually taken in St. Paul’s epistles :) “ and whom he called, them he also justified,” (the word is here taken in its widest sense, as including sanctification also,) “ and whom he justified, them he glorified.” Thence, to the end of the chapter, he strongly encourages all those who had the love of God shed abroad in their hearts, to have a good hope, that no sufferings should ever “ be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus.”

XXVI. But as the apostle was aware, how deeply the Jews were offended at the whole tenor of his doctrine, and more especially at his asserting, 1. That the Jews themselves could not be saved without believing in Jesus ; and, 2. That the Heathens, by believing in him, might partake of the same salvation ; he spends the whole ninth chapter upon them : wherein, 1. He declares the tender love he had for them, ver. 1. 3. 2. Allows the great national privileges they enjoyed above any people under heaven, ver. 4, 5. 3. Answers their grand objection to his doctrine, taken from the justice of God, to their fathers, ver. 6—13. 4. Removes another objection, taken from the justice of God, interweaving all along strong reproofs to the Jews, for priding themselves on those privileges, which were owing merely to the good pleasure of God, not to their fathers’ goodness any more than their own, ver. 11. 23. 5. Resumes and proves by Scripture his former assertion, that many Jews would be lost, and many Heathens saved, ver. 24—29. And, lastly, sums up the general drift of this chapter, and indeed of the whole epistle *What shall we say then?* What is the conclusion from the whole ? The sum of all which has been spoken ? Why, that many Gentiles already partake of the great salvation, and many Jews fall short of it. *Wherefore?* Because they would not receive it by faith. And whosoever believeth not, cannot be saved ; whereas, *whosoever believeth in Christ, whether Jew or Gentile, shall not be ashamed*, ver. 30. 33

XXVII. Those words, “ Hath not the potter power over his own clay ?” are part of St. Paul’s answer to that objection, that it was

unjust for God to show that mercy to the Gentiles, which he withheld from his own people. This he first simply denies, saying, *God forbid!* And then observes, that according to his own words to Moses, God has a right to fix the terms on which he will show mercy, which neither the will nor the power of man can alter, ver. 15, 16; and to withdraw his mercy from them, who, like Pharaoh, will not comply with those terms, ver. 17. And that accordingly, “he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy,” namely, those that truly believe; *and whom he will*, namely, obstinate unbelievers, he suffers to be hardened.

XXVIII. But why then, say the objectors, doth he find fault with those that are hardened? “For who hath resisted his will?” ver 19 To this insolent misconstruction of what he had said, the apostle first gives a severe rebuke, and then adds, “Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?” Why hast thou made me capable of salvation, only on those terms? None indeed *hath resisted this will of God*, “he that believeth not shall be damned.” But is this any ground for arraigning his justice? *Hath not the great Potter power over his own clay? to make, or appoint one sort of vessels, namely believers, to honour, and the others, unto dishonour?* Hath he not a right to distribute eternal honour and dishonour, on whatever terms he pleases? Especially considering the goodness and patience he shows, even towards them that believe not; considering that when they have provoked him *to show his wrath, and make the power of his vengeance known, yet he endures, with much long-suffering*, even those *vessels of wrath*, who had before fitted themselves for *destruction*. There is then no more room to reply against God, for making his vengeance known on those vessels of wrath, than for *making known* his glorious love “on the vessels of mercy whom he had before prepared for glory; even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles.”

XXIX. I have spoken more largely than I designed, in order to show, that neither our Lord, in the above-mentioned parable, nor St. Paul, in these words, had any view to God’s sovereign power, as the ground of unconditional reprobation. And beware that you go no further therein, than you are authorized by them. Take care, whenever you speak of these high things, to “speak as the Oracles of God.” And if so, you will never speak of the sovereignty of God, but in conjunction with his other attributes. For the Scripture nowhere speaks of this single attribute, as separate from the rest. Much less does it any where speak of the sovereignty of God, as singly disposing the eternal states of men. No, no: in this awful work, God proceeds according to the known rules of his justice and mercy. But never assign his sovereignty as the cause why any man is punished with everlasting destruction.

XXX. Now then, are you not quite out of your way? You are not in the way which God hath revealed. You are putting eternal happiness and misery on an unscriptural, and very dreadful footing. Make the case your own. Here are you, a sinner, convinced that

you deserve the damnation of hell. Sorrow, therefore, and fear have filled your heart. And how shall you be comforted? By the promises of God. But perhaps you have no part therein; for they belong only to the elect. By the consideration of his love and tender mercy? but what are these to *you*, if you are a reprobate? God does not love *you* at all. *You*, like Esau, he hath hated, even from eternity. What ground then can you have for the least shadow of hope? Why, it is *possible*, that is all, that God's sovereign will may be on your side; *possibly* God may save you, because he will! O poor encouragement to despairing sinners! I fear *faith* rarely *cometh* by hearing this!

XXXI. The sovereignty of God is then never to be brought to supersede his justice. And this is the present objection against unconditional reprobation, (the plain consequence of unconditional election;) it flatly contradicts, indeed utterly overthrows, the Scripture account of the justice of God. This has been proved in general already: let us now weigh a few particulars. And, 1. The Scripture describes God as the Judge of the earth. But how shall God, in justice, judge the world, (O consider this, as in the presence of God, with reverence and godly fear!) How shall God, in justice, judge the world, if there be any decree of reprobation? On this supposition, what should those on the left hand be condemned for? For their having done evil? They could not help it. There never was a time when they could have helped it. God, you say, of old, ordained them to this condemnation. And "who hath resisted his will?" He sold them, you say, "to work wickedness," even from their mother's womb. He "gave them up to a reprobate mind," or ever they hung upon their mother's breast. Shall he then condemn them for what they could not help? Shall the Just, the Holy One of Israel, adjudge millions of men to everlasting pain, because their blood moved in their veins? Nay, this they might have helped by putting an end to their lives. But could they even then have escaped from sin? Not without that grace which you suppose God had absolutely determined never to give them. And yet you suppose him to send them into eternal fire, for not escaping from sin—that is, in plain terms, for not having that grace which God had decreed they should never have! O strange justice! What a picture do you draw of the Judge of all the earth?

XXXII. Are they not rather condemned, for not doing good, according to those solemn words of the great Judge, "Depart, ye cursed,—For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink; a stranger, and ye took me not in; I was naked, and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they answer,"—But how much better an answer do you put into their mouths! Upon your supposition, might they not say, (O consider it well, in meekness and fear!) Lord, we might have done the outward work: but thou knowest, it would have but increased our damnation. We might have fed the hungry, given drink to the thirsty, and covered the naked with a garment

But all these works, without any special grace, which we never had, nor possibly could have, (seeing thou hadst eternally decreed to withhold it from us,) would only have been *splendid sins*. They would only have heated the furnace of hell, seven times hotter than before. Upon *your* supposition, might they not say, "Righteous art thou, O Lord, yet let us plead with thee? O why dost thou condemn us for not doing good? Was it possible for us to do any thing well? Did we ever abuse the power of doing good? We never received it, and that thou knowest. Wilt thou, the Holy One, the Just, condemn us for not doing, what we never had the power to do? Wilt thou condemn us for not casting down the stars from heaven? For not holding the winds in our fists? Why it was as possible for us to do this, as to do any work acceptable in thy sight! O Lord, correct us, but with judgment; and before thou plungest us into everlasting fire, let us know, how it was ever possible for us to escape the damnation of hell?"

XXXIII. Or how could they have escaped (suppose you assign that as the cause of their condemnation,) from inward sin? from evil desires? from unholiness and vile affections? Were they ever able to deliver their own souls; to rescue themselves from this inward hell? If so, their not doing it may justly be laid to their charge, and would leave them without excuse. But it was not so: they never were able to deliver their own souls. They never had power to rescue themselves from the hands of those bosom enemies. This talent was never put into their hands. How then can they be condemned for hiding it in the earth? For non-improvement of what they never had? Who is able to purify a corrupt heart? to "bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Is man, mere man, sufficient for this? No, certainly. God alone. To him only can the polluted of heart say, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." But what if he answer, "I will not, because I will not: be thou unclean still." Will God doom that man to the bottomless pit, because of that uncleanness, which he could not save himself from, and which God could have saved him from, but would not? Verily, were an earthly king to execute such justice as this upon his helpless subjects, it might well be expected that the vengeance of the Lord would soon sweep him from the face of the earth.

XXXIV. Perhaps you will say, "They are not condemned for actual, but for original sin." What do you mean by this term? The inward corruption of our nature? If so, it has been spoken of before. Or do you mean the sin which Adam committed in Paradise? That this is imputed to all men, I allow; yea, that by reason hereof "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." But that any will be damned for this alone, I allow not, till you show me where it is written. Bring me plain proof from the Scripture, and I submit. But till then I utterly deny it.

XXXV. Should you not rather say, that unbelief is the damning sin? and that those who are condemned in that day, will be therefore condemned, "because they believed not on the name of the only-

begotten Son of God?" But could they believe? Was not this faith both the gift and the work of God in the soul? And was it not a gift which he had eternally decreed never to give them? Was it not a work which he was of old unchangeably determined never to work in their souls? Shall these men then be condemned, because God would not work; because they did not receive what God would not give? Could they "ungrasp the hold of his right hand, or force Omnipotence?"

XXXVI. There is, over and above, a peculiar difficulty here. You say, Christ did not die for those men. But if so, there was an impossibility, in the very nature of the thing, that they should ever savingly believe. For what is saving faith, but "a confidence in God that Christ loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*? Loved *thee*, thou reprobate, gave himself for *thee*!" Away, thou hast neither part nor lot herein. Thou believe in Christ, thou accursed spirit! damned or ever thou wert born! There never was any object for thy faith; there never was any thing for thee to believe. God himself, (thus must you speak, to be consistent with yourself,) with all his omnipotence, could not have made thee believe Christ atoned for thy sins, unless he had made thee believe a lie!

XXXVII. If, then, God be just, there cannot, on your scheme, be any judgment to come. We may add, nor any future state, either of reward or punishment. If there be such a state, God will therein "render to every man according to his works. To them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life: but to them that do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil."

But how is this reconcileable with your scheme? You say, the reprobates cannot but do evil; and that the elect, from the day of God's power, cannot but continue in well-doing. You suppose all this is unchangeably decreed: in consequence whereof, God acts irresistibly on the one, and Satan on the other. Then it is impossible for either one or the other, to *help acting* as they do: or rather, to *help* being *acted upon* in the manner wherein they are. For if we speak properly, neither the one nor the other can be said to *act* at all. Can a stone be said to act when it is thrown out of a sling? or a ball, when it is projected from a cannon? No more can a man be said to act, if he be only moved by a force he cannot resist. But if the case be thus, you leave no room either for reward or punishment. Shall the stone be rewarded for rising from the sling, or punished for falling down? Shall the cannon-ball be rewarded for flying towards the sun, or punished for receding from it? As incapable of either punishment or reward is the man, who is supposed to be impelled by a force he cannot resist. Justice can have no place in rewarding or punishing mere machines, driven to and fro by an external force. So that your supposition of God's ordaining from eternity whatsoever should be done to the end of the world, as well as that of God's acting irresistibly in the elect, and Satan's acting irresistibly in the reprobates,

dates : utterly overthrows the Scripture doctrine of rewards and punishments, as well as of a judgment to come.

XXXVIII. Thus ill does that election which implies reprobation, agree with the Scripture account of God's Justice. And does it agree any better with his Truth ? How will you reconcile it with those plain passages. (Ezek. xviii. 23, &c.) "Have I any pleasure at all, that the wicked should die, saith the Lord God ? And not that he should return from his ways and live ? Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed,—for why will ye die, O house of Israel ? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord : wherefore turn yourselves and live ye."

Ezek. xxxiii. 11, &c. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked : but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways ; for why will ye die, O house of Israel ?"

XXXIX. But perhaps you will say, "These ought to be limited and explained by other passages of Scripture ; wherein this doctrine is as clearly affirmed as it is denied in these ?" I must answer very plainly, If this were true, we must give up all the Scriptures together : nor would the infidels allow the Bible so honourable a title, as that of "a cunningly devised fable." But it is not true. It has no colour of truth. It is absolutely, notoriously false. To tear up the very roots of reprobation, and of all doctrines that have a necessary connection therewith, God declares in his word these three things, and that explicitly, in so many terms, 1. "Christ died for all," (2 Cor. v. 14,) namely, all that *were dead* in sin, as the words immediately following fix the sense : here is the fact affirmed. 2. "He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world," (1 John ii. 2,) even of all those for whom he died : here is the consequence of his dying for all. And, 3. "He died for all, that they should not live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them," (2 Cor. v. 15,) that they might be saved from their sins : here is the design, the end of his dying for them. Now show me the scriptures wherein God declares in equally express terms, 1. "Christ did not die for all," but for some only. 2. "Christ is not the propitiation for the sins of the world ;" and, 3. "He did not die for all, at least not with that intent, that they should live unto him who died for them." Show me, I say, the scriptures that affirm these three things in equally express terms. You know there are none. Nor is it possible to evade the force of those above recited, but by supplying in number what is wanting in weight ; by heaping abundance of texts together, whereby (though none of them speak home to the point) the patrons of that opinion, dazzle the eyes of the unwary, and quite overlay the understanding both of themselves, and those that hear them.

XL. To proceed. What an account does this doctrine give of the sincerity of God in a thousand declarations, such as these : "O that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me, and keep my commandments always ! that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever." Deut. v. 29. "My people would

not hear my voice, and Israel would not obey me. So I gave them up unto their own hearts' lusts, and let them follow their own imaginations. O that my people would have hearkened unto me ! For if Israel had walked in my ways, I should soon have put down their enemies, and turned my hand against their adversaries." Ps. lxxxii. 12, &c. And all this time you suppose God had unchangeably ordained, that there never should be *such a heart in them* ! that it never should be possible for the people whom he thus *seemed* to lament over, to *hearken unto him*, or to *walk in his ways* !

XLI. How clear and strong is the reasoning of Dr. Watts on this head ? "It is very hard indeed to vindicate the *sincerity* of the blessed God or his Son, in their universal offers of grace and salvation to men, and their sending ministers with such messages and invitations to accept of mercy, if there be not, at least, a conditional pardon and salvation provided for them.

"His ministers indeed, as they know not the event of things, may be sincere in offering salvation to all persons, according to their general commission, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' But how can God or Christ be *sincere* in sending them with this commission, to offer his grace to all men, if God has not provided such grace for all men, no, not so much as conditionally ?

"It is hard to suppose, that the great God, who is truth itself, and faithful in all his dealings, should call upon dying men, to trust in a Saviour for eternal life, when this Saviour has not eternal life intrusted with him, to give them if they do as he requires. It is hard to conceive how the great Governor of the world can be sincere in inviting sinners, who are on the brink of hell, to cast themselves upon an empty word of invitation, a mere shadow and appearance of support, if there be nothing real to bear them up from those deeps of destruction, nothing but mere words and empty invitations ! Can we think that the righteous and holy God would encourage his ministers, to call them to leave and rest the weight of their immortal concerns upon a gospel¹, a covenant of grace, a Mediator, and his merit and righteousness ; all which are a mere nothing with regard to them, a heap of empty names, an unsupporting void which cannot uphold them ?"

XLI. Our blessed Lord does indisputably command and invite "all men every where to repent." He calleth all. He sends his ambassadors in his name, "to preach the gospel to every creature." He himself "preached deliverance to the captives," without any hint of restriction or limitation. But now in what manner do you represent him, while he is employed in this work ? You suppose him to be standing at the prison doors, having the keys thereof in his hands, and to be continually inviting the prisoners to come forth, commanding them to accept of that invitation, urging every motive which can possibly induce them to comply with that command ; adding the most precious promises, if they obey ; the most dreadful threatenings, if they obey not : and all this time you suppose him to

be unalterably determined in himself, never to open the doors for them ! Even while he is crying, “ Come ye, come ye, from that evil place ; for why will ye die, O house of Israel ? ” “ Why ? (might one of them reply,) because we cannot help it. We *cannot* help ourselves ; and thou *wilt* not help us. It is not in our power to break the gates of brass : and it is not thy pleasure to open them. Why *will* ye die ? We *must* die : because it is not thy *will* to save us.” Alas ! my brethren ! what kind of sincerity is this, which you ascribe to God our Saviour ?

XLIII. So ill do election and reprobation agree with the truth and sincerity of God. But do they not agree least of all with the scriptural account of his love and goodness ? that attribute which God peculiarly claims, wherein he glories above all the rest. It is not written, *God is justice, or God is truth*, (although he is just and true in all his ways;) but it is written, *God is love*, love in the abstract, without bounds ; and “there is no end of his goodness.” His love extends even to those who neither love nor fear him. He is good, even to the evil and the unthankful : yea, without any exception or limitation, to all the children of men. For “the Lord is loving (or good) to every man, and his mercy is over all his works.”

But how is God good or loving to a *reprobate*, or one that is not *elected* ? (You may choose either term : for if none but the unconditionally elect are saved, it comes precisely to the same thing.) You cannot say, he is an object of the love or goodness of God, with regard to his eternal state, whom he created (says Mr. Calvin, plainly and fairly,) *in vita contumeliam et mortis exitium, to live a reproach and die everlasting*. Surely no one can dream that the goodness of God is at all concerned with this man’s eternal state. “ However, God is good to him in this world.” What ! when by reason of God’s unchangeable decree, it had been good for this man never to have been born, when his very birth was a curse, not a blessing ? “ Well, but he now enjoys many of the gifts of God, both gifts of nature and of providence. He has food and raiment, and comforts of various kinds. And are not all these great blessings ? ” No, not to him. At the price he is to pay for them, every one of these also is a curse. Every one of these comforts is, by an eternal decree, to cost him a thousand pangs in hell. For every moment’s pleasure which he now enjoys, he is to suffer the torments of more than a thousand years : for the smoke of that pit which is preparing for him, ascendeth up for ever and ever ! God knew this would be the fruit of whatever he should enjoy, before the vapour of life fled away. He designed it should. It was his very purpose in giving him those enjoyments. So that by all these, according to *your* account, he is, in truth and reality, only fattening the ox for the slaughter. “ Nay, but God gives him grace too.” Yes ; but what kind of grace ? *Saving grace* you own he has none ; none of a saving nature. And the *common grace* he has, was not given with any design to save his soul : nor with any design to do him any good at all ; but only to restrain him from hurting the elect. So far from doing

him good, that this grace also necessarily increases his damnation. And God knows this, you say ; and designed it should ; it was one great end for which he gave it ! Then I desire to know, how is God good or loving to this man, either with regard to time or eternity ?

XLIV Let us suppose a particular instance. Here stands a man who is reprobated from all eternity ; or, if you would express it more smoothly, one who is not elected, whom God eternally decreed to pass by. Thou hast nothing therefore to expect from God after death, but to be cast into the lake of fire burning with brimstone ; God having consigned thy unborn soul to hell, by a decree which cannot pass away. And from the time thou wast born under the irrevocable curse of God, thou canst have no peace. For there is no peace to the wicked, and such thou art doomed to continue, even from thy mother's womb. Accordingly God giveth thee of this world's goods on purpose to enhance thy damnation. He giveth thee now substance or friends, in order hereafter to heap the more coals of fire upon thy head. He filleth thee with food, he maketh thee fat and well-liking, to make thee a more specious sacrifice to his vengeance. Good-nature, generosity, a good understanding, various knowledge, it may be, or eloquence, are the flowers wherewith he adorneth thee, thou poor victim, before thou art brought to the slaughter. Thou hast grace too ! But what grace ? Not saving grace. That is not for thee, but for the elect only. Thine may properly be termed *damning grace* ; since it is not only such in the event, but in the intention. Thou receivedst it of God for that very end. That thou mightest receive the greater damnation. It was given, not to convert thee, but only to convince ; not to make thee without sin, but without excuse ; not to destroy, but to arm the worm that never dieth, and to blow up the fire that never shall be quenched !

XLV Now I beseech you to consider calmly, how is God good or loving to this man ? Is not this such love as makes your blood run cold ? as causes the ears of him that heareth to tingle ? And can you believe there is that man on earth or in hell, who can truly tell God, " Thus hast thou done ? " Can you think, that the loving, the merciful God ever dealt thus with any soul which he had made ? But you must and do believe this, if you believe unconditional election. For it holds reprobation in its bosom : they never were, never can be divided. Take then your choice. If for the sake of election you will swallow reprobation, well. But if you cannot digest this, you must necessarily give up unconditional election.

XLVI. " But you cannot do this : for then you should be called a Pelagian, an Arminian, and what not." And are you afraid of hard names ? Then you have not begun to be a disciple of Jesus Christ. " No, that is not the case. But you are afraid, if you do not hold election, you must hold free-will, and so rob God of his glory, in man's salvation."

I answer, 1. Many of the greatest maintainers of election, utterly deny the consequence, and do not allow, that even natural free-will

in man, is repugnant to God's glory. These accordingly assert, that every man living has a measure of natural free-will. So the *Assembly of Divines*, (and therein the body of Calvinists both in England and Scotland,) "God hath endued the will of man with that *natural liberty*, that is neither forced, nor, by any absolute necessity of nature determined to do good or evil :" chap. ix. And this they assert of man in his fallen state, even before he receives the grace of God.

But I do not carry free-will so far ; (I mean not in moral things,) *natural free-will*, in the present state of mankind, I do not understand, I only assert, that there is a measure of free-will *supernaturally* restored to every man, together with that *supernatural* light, which "enlightens every man that cometh into the world." But indeed, whether this be natural or not, as to your objection it matters not. For that equally lies against both, against any free-will of any kind : your assertion being thus, "If man has any free-will, God cannot have the whole glory of his salvation." Or, "It is not so much for the glory of God, to save man as a free-agent, put into a capacity of concurring with his grace on the one hand, and of resisting it on the other ; as to save him in the way of a necessary agent, by a power which he cannot possibly resist."

XLVII. With regard to the former of these assertions, "If man has any free-will, then God cannot have the whole glory of his salvation," is your meaning this : "If man has any power to *work out his own salvation*, then God cannot have the whole glory ?" If it be, I must ask again, What do you mean by God's "having the whole glory ?" Do you mean, "his doing the whole work, without any concurrence on man's part ?" If so, your assertion is, "If man do at all *work together with* God, in *working out his own salvation*, then God does not do the whole work, without man's *working together with him*." Most true; most sure ; but cannot you see how God nevertheless may have all the glory ? Why the very power to "work together with him," was from God. Therefore, to him is all the glory. Has not even experience taught you this ? Have you not often felt, in a particular temptation, power either to resist or yield to the grace of God ? And when you have yielded to work together with him, did you not find it very possible, notwithstanding, to give him all the glory ? So that both experience and Scripture are against you here, and make it clear to every impartial inquirer, that though man has *freedom* to work, or not *work together with* God, yet may God have the whole glory of his salvation.

XLVIII. If, then, you say, "We ascribe to God alone, the whole glory of our salvation," I answer, So do we too. If you add, "Nay, but we affirm, that God alone does the whole work, without man's working at all ;" in one sense, we allow this also. We allow it is the work of God alone, to justify, to sanctify, and to glorify, which three comprehend the whole of salvation. Yet we cannot allow, that man can only resist, and not in any wise *work together with* God : or, that God is so the whole worker of our salvation, as to exclude man's working at all. This I dare not say ; for I cannot prove it by

Scripture : nay, it is flatly contrary thereto : for the Scripture is express, that (having received power from God) we are to "work out our own salvation :" and that (after the work of God is begun in our souls) we are "workers together with him."

XLIX. Your objection, proposed in another form, is this : "It is not so much for the glory of God, to save man as a free-agent, put into a capacity of either concurring with, or resisting his grace ; as to save him in the way of a necessary agent, by a power which he cannot possibly resist."

O that the Lord would answer for himself ! that he would arise and maintain his own cause ! that he would no longer suffer his servants, few as they are, to weaken one another's hands, and to be wearied not only with "the contradiction of sinners," but even of those who are in a measure saved from sin ! "Wo is me that I am constrained to dwell with Meshech ! among them that are enemies to peace ! I labour for peace : but when I speak thereof, they [still] make themselves ready for battle."

L. If it must be then, let us look one another in the face. How is it more for the glory of God, to save man irresistibly, than to save him as a free-agent, by such grace as he may either concur with or resist ? I fear you have a confused, unscriptural notion of "the glory of God." What do you mean by that expression ? The glory of God, strictly speaking, in his glorious essence and his attributes, which have been ever of old. And this glory admits of no increase, being the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. But the Scripture frequently speaks of the glory of God, in a sense something different from this : meaning thereby, the manifestation of his essential glory, of his eternal power and godhead, and of his glorious attributes, more especially his justice, mercy, and truth. And it is in this sense alone, that the glory of God is said to be advanced by man. Now then this is the point which it lies on you to prove, "that it does more eminently manifest the glorious attributes of God, more especially his justice, mercy, and truth, to save man irresistibly, than to save him by such grace as it is in his power either to concur with, or to resist."

LI. But you must not imagine, I will be so unwise as to engage you here on this single point. I shall not now dispute, (which yet might be done,) whether salvation by irresistible grace, (which indeed makes man a mere machine, and consequently no more rewardable than punishable,) whether, I say, salvation by irresistible grace, considered apart from its consequences, manifest the glory of God more or less, than salvation by grace which may be resisted. Not so : (but by the assistance of God,) I shall take your whole scheme together : irresistible grace for the elect, implying the denial of saving grace to all others : or unconditional election, with its inseparable companion, unconditional reprobation.

The case is clearly this. You may drive me, on the one hand, unless I will contradict myself, or retract my principles, to own a measure of free-will in every man, (though not by nature as the Assembly of Divines.) And on the other hand, I can drive you, and every assertor of unconditional election, unless you will contradict

yourself, or retract your principles, to own unconditional reprobation.

Stand forth then, Free-will, on the one side, and Reprobation on the other. And let us see, whether the one scheme attended with the absurdity as you think it) of free-will ; or the other scheme, attended with the absurdity of reprobation, be the more defensible. Let us see (if it please the Father of Lights to open the eyes of our understanding) which of these is more for the glory of God, for the display of his glorious attributes, for the manifestation of his wisdom, justice, and mercy to the sons of men.

LII. First, his Wisdom. If man be in some measure free, if by that Light which “ lighteneth every man that comes into the world,” there be “ set before him life and death, good and evil ;” then how gloriously does the manifold wisdom of God appear in the whole economy of man’s salvation ? Being willing that all men should be saved, yet not willing to force them thereto ; willing that men should be saved, yet not as trees or stones, but as men, as reasonable creatures, endued with understanding to discern what is good, and liberty, either to accept or refuse it ? how does he suit the whole scheme of his dispensations to this his *προθεσμία*, his plan, *the counsel of his will* ? His first step is, to enlighten the understanding, by that general knowledge of good and evil. To this he adds many secret reproofs, if they act contrary to this light ; many inward convictions, which there is not a man on earth who has not often felt. At other times he gently moves their wills, he draws and woos them (as it were) to walk in the light. He instils into their hearts desires, though perhaps they knew not from whence they came. Thus far he proceeds with all the children of men, yea, even those who have not the knowledge of his written word. But in this, what a field of wisdom is displayed, suppose man to be in some degree a free-agent ? How is every part of it suited to this end ? To save man as man ; to set life and death before him, and then persuade (not force him) to choose life. According to this grand purpose of God, a perfect rule is first set before him to serve as a “ lantern to his feet, and a light in all his paths.” This is offered to him in the form of a law, enforced with the strongest sanctions, the most glorious rewards for them that obey, the severest penalties on them that break it. To reclaim these, God uses all manner of ways ; he tries every avenue of their souls. He applies sometimes to their understanding, showing them the folly of their sins : sometimes to their affections, tenderly expostulating with them for their ingratitude, and even condescending to ask, “ What could I have done for you (consistent with my eternal purpose not to force you) which I have not done ? ” He intermixes sometimes threats, “ Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish ;” sometimes promises, “ Your sins and your iniquities will I remember no more.” Now what wisdom is seen in all this, if man may indeed choose life or death ? But if every man be unalterably consigned to heaven or hell, before he comes from his mother’s womb, where is the wisdom of this ; of dealing with him in every respect, *as if he were*

free, when it is no such thing ? What avails, what can this whole dispensation of God avail a reprobate ? What are promises or threats, expostulations or reproofs, to thee, thou fire-brand of hell ? What indeed (O my brethren, suffer me to speak, for *I am full of matter*) but empty force, but mere grimace, sounding words that mean just nothing ? O where (to waive all other considerations now) is the *wisdom* of this proceeding ? To what end does all this apparatus serve ? If you say, to ensure his damnation ; alas ! what needeth that ? seeing this was ensured before the foundation of the world. Let all mankind, then, judge, which of these accounts is more for the glory of God's wisdom.

LIII. We come, next, to his justice. Now if a man be capable of choosing good or evil, then he is a proper object of the justice of God, acquitting or condemning, rewarding or punishing. But otherwise he is not. A mere machine is not capable of being either acquitted or condemned. Justice cannot punish a stone for falling to the ground ; nor (on *your scheme*) a man for falling into sin. For he can no more help it than the stone, if he be (in *your sense*) "fore-ordained to this condemnation." Why does this man sin ? "He cannot cease from sin ?" Why cannot he cease from sin ? "Because he has no saving grace." Why has he no saving grace ? "Because God of his own good pleasure hath eternally decreed, not to give it him." Is he then under an unavoidable necessity of sinning ? "Yes : as much as a stone is of falling. He never had any more power to cease from evil, than a stone has to hang in the air." And shall this man, for not doing what he never could do, and for doing what he never could avoid, be sentenced to depart into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels ? "Yes, because it is the sovereign will of God."—Then 'you have either found a new God or *made* one !' This is not the God of the Christians. Our God is just in all his ways : he reapeth not where he hath not strewed. He requireth only according to what he hath given : and where he hath given little, little is required. The glory of his justice is this, to 'reward every man according to his works.' Hereby is that glorious attribute shown, evidently set forth before men and angels, in that it is accepted of every man according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not. This is that just decree which cannot pass away either in time or eternity.

Thus one scheme gives the justice of God its full scope, leaves room for it to be largely displayed in all its branches : whereas the other makes it a mere shadow, yea, brings it absolutely to nothing.

LIV Just as gloriously does it display his Love ! supposing it to be fixed on one in ten of his creatures ! (might I not rather say, on one in a hundred ?) and to have no regard to the rest. Let the ninety and nine reprobates perish without mercy. It is enough for him to love and save the one elect. But why will he have mercy on these alone, and leave all those to inevitable destruction ? "He will—because he will !" O that God would give unto you who thus speak, meekness of wisdom ! then would I ask, What would the universal voice of mankind pronounce of the man that should act thus ? That

being able to deliver millions of men from death, with a single breath of his mouth, should refuse to save any more than one in a hundred, and say, "I will not, because I will not?" How then do you exalt the mercy of God, when you ascribe such a proceeding to him? What a strange comment is this on his own word, that "his mercy is over all his works!"

Do you think to evade this by saying, "His mercy is more displayed in irresistibly saving the elect, than it would be in giving the choice of salvation to all men, and actual salvation to those that accepted it?" How so? Make this appear if you can. What proof do you bring of this assertion? I appeal to every impartial mind, whether the reverse be not obviously true? Whether the mercy of God would not be far less gloriously displayed, in saving a few by his irresistible power, and leaving all the rest without help, without hope, to perish everlasting, than in offering salvation to every creature, actually saving all that consent thereto, and doing for the rest, all that infinite wisdom, almighty power, and boundless love can do, without *forcing* them to be saved, which would be to destroy the very nature that he had given them. I appeal, I say, to every impartial mind, and to your own, if not quite blinded with prejudice, which of these accounts places the mercy of God in the most advantageous light?

LV Perhaps you will say, "But there are other attributes of God, namely, his sovereignty, unchangeableness, and faithfulness. I hope you do not deny these." I answer, No; by no means. The sovereignty of God appears, 1. In fixing from eternity that decree touching the sons of men, "He that believeth shall be saved: He that believeth not shall be damned." 2. In all the general circumstances of creation; in the time, the place, the manner of creating all things: in appointing the number and kinds of creatures, visible and invisible: 3. In allotting the natural endowments of men, these to one, and those to another: 4. In disposing the time, place, and other outward circumstances, (as parents, relations,) attending the birth of every one: 5. In dispensing the various gifts of the Spirit, for the edification of his church: 6. In ordering all temporal things, (as health, fortune, friends,) every thing short of eternity. But in disposing the eternal states of men, (allowing only what was observed under the first article,) it is clear, that not sovereignty alone, but justice, mercy, and truth, hold the reins. The governor of heaven and earth, the "I AM," over all, God, blessed for ever, takes no step here, but as these direct, and prepare the way before his face. This is his eternal and irresistible will, as he hath revealed unto us by his Spirit: declaring in the strongest terms, adding his oath to his word, and because he could swear by no greater, swearing by himself, "As I live, saith the **Lord God**, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth. The death of him that dieth can never be resolved into my pleasure or sovereign will. No! it is impossible. We challenge all mankind, to bring one clear, scriptural proof to the contrary. You can bring no Scripture proof that God ever did, or assertion that he ever will, act as *mere Sovereign* in eternally condemning any soul that ever was, or will be born into the world.

LVI. Now, you are probably thinking of Esau and Pharaoh. Do you then set it down as an unquestionable truth, that these were certainly condemned, by the *mere sovereign will* of God? Are you sure, that they were *eternally* condemned? Even that point is not altogether certain. It is no where affirmed in Holy Writ: and it would cost you some pains to prove it. It is true, Pharaoh's death was a punishment from God; but it does not follow that he was punished everlasting. And if he were, it was not by the *mere sovereign will of God*, but because of his own stubbornness and impenitence.

Of this Moses has given us a particular account: accordingly we read, "When Pharaoh saw that there was respite," (after he was delivered from the plague of frogs) "he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." (Exod. viii. 13.) So after the plague of flies: "Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go." (ver. 32.) Again, "When Pharaoh saw, that the rain and the hail were ceased, he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants." (Exod. ix. 34.) After God had given him all this space to repent, and had expostulated with him for his obstinate impenitence in those solemn words: "How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me?" (chap. x. 3.) What wonder is it, if God then *hardened his heart*; that is, permitted Satan to harden it? if he at length wholly withdrew his softening grace, and "gave him up to a reprobate mind?"

LVII. The case of Esau is widely different from this: although his conduct also is blameable in many points.—The first was his selling his birth-right to Jacob. (Gen. xxv. 31, &c.) The next his marrying against his father's consent. (xxvi. 34, 35.) But it is highly probable he was sensible of his fault; because Isaac appears to have been fully reconciled to him, when he said, "My son, make me savoury meat, that my soul may bless thee before I die." Gen. xxvii. 4.

In the following verses we have an account of the manner wherein he was supplanted by his brother Jacob. Upon Isaac's relation of this, "Esau cried with a great and exceeding bitter cry; (ver. 34.) and said unto his father, bless me, even me also, O my father!" "But he found no place (says the Apostle) for repentance," [for recovering the blessing,] "though he sought it carefully with tears." "Thy brother (said Isaac) hath taken away thy blessing; I have blessed him, yea, and he shall be blessed." So that all Esau's sorrow and tears could not recover his birth-right, and the blessing annexed thereto.

And yet there is great reason to hope, that Esau (as well as Jacob) is now in Abraham's bosom. For although for a time he *hated* Jacob, and afterward came against him *with four hundred men*, very probably designing to take revenge for the injuries he had sustained yet we find, when they met, "Esau ran and embraced him, and fell on his neck and kissed him." So thoroughly had God changed his heart. And why should we doubt but that happy change continued?

LVIII. You can ground no solid objection to this, on St. Paul's words, in the Epistle to the Romans: "It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger: as it is written, Jacob have I loved

but Esau have I hated." chap. ix. 12, 13. For it is undeniably plain, that both these scriptures relate, not to the persons of Jacob and Esau, but to their descendants; the Israelites sprung from Jacob, and the Edomites sprung from Esau. In this sense only did *the elder* (Esau) *serve the younger*; not in his person; (for Esau never served Jacob;) but in his posterity. The posterity of the elder brother served the posterity of the younger.

The other text referred to by the Apostle, runs thus: "I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness." Mal. i. 2. Whose heritage was it that God laid waste? Not that which Esau personally enjoyed; but that of his posterity, the Edomites; for their enormous sins, largely described by several of the Prophets. So neither here is there any instance of any man being finally condemned, by the *merc* *sovereign* will of God.

LIX. The *unchangeableness* of God we allow likewise, "In him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." But you seem to lie under a mistake, concerning this also, for want of observing the Scripture account of it. The Scripture teaches, 1. That God is unchangeable, with regard to his decrees. But what decrees? The same that he has commanded to be *preached to every creature*. "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned." The Scripture teaches, 2. That God is unchangeable with regard to his love and hatred. But how? Observe this well; for it is your grand mistake, and the root of almost all the rest. God unchangeably loveth righteousness, and hateth iniquity. Unchangeably he loveth faith, and unchangeably hateth unbelief. In consequence thereof, he unchangeably loves the righteous, and hateth the workers of iniquity. He unchangeably loves them that believe, and hates wilful, obstinate unbelievers. So that the Scripture account of God's unchangeableness, with regard to his decrees, is this: he has unchangeably decreed to save holy believers, and to condemn obstinate, impenitent unbelievers. And, according to Scripture, his unchangeableness of *affection*, properly and primarily regards tempers and not persons: and persons (as Enoch, Noah, Abraham,) only as those tempers are found in them. Let then the unchangeableness of God be put on the right footing; let the Scripture be allowed to fix the objects of it, and it will as soon prove transubstantiation, as unconditional Election.

LX. The *faithfulness* of God may be termed a branch of his truth. He will *perform* what he hath *promised*. But then let us inquire of the Oracles of God to whom are the promises made? the promises of life and immortality? The answer is, "To Abraham and his seed," that is, to those who walk in the steps of the faith of their father Abraham. To those who believe, as believers, are the gospel-promises made. To these hath the faithful God engaged, that he will do what he hath spoken. "He will fulfil his covenant and promise which he hath made to a thousand generations:" the sum of which is, (as we find it expressly declared by the Spirit of God,) "The Lord

will give grace (more grace) and glory, and no good thing will he withhold from them that live a godly life."

LXI. This covenant of God I understand; but I have heard of another which I understand not. I have heard, "That God the Father made a covenant with his Son, before the world began, wherein the Son agreed to suffer such and such things, and the Father to give him such and such souls for a recompense; that, in consequence of this, those souls *must* be saved, and those only, so that all others *must* be damned." I beseech you, where is this written? In what part of Scripture is this covenant to be found? We may well expect a thing of this moment to be revealed very expressly, with the utmost clearness and solemnity! But where is this done? And if it is not done, if there is no such account in all the Bible, which shall we wonder at most, that any serious man should advance, or that thousands should believe so strange an assertion, without one plain text of Scripture to support it, from Genesis to the Revelation?

LXII. I suppose you do not imagine that the bare word *covenant*, if it occurred ever so often in Holy Writ, is a proof of any such covenant as this. The grand covenant which we allow to be mentioned therein, is a covenant between God and man, established in the hands of a Mediator, who "tasted death for every man," and thereby purchased it for all the children of men. The tenor of it (so often mentioned already) is this: "Whosoever believeth unto the end, so as to show his faith by his works, I the Lord will reward that soul eternally: but whosoever will not believe, and, consequently, dieth in his sins, I will punish him with everlasting destruction."

LXIII. To examine thoroughly whether this covenant between God and man be unconditional or conditional, it may be needful to go back as far as Abraham, the Father of the faithful, to inquire what manner of covenant it was which God made with him; and whether any reason be assigned of God's peculiarly blessing Abraham, and all the nations of the earth in him.

The first mention of the covenant between God and him, occurs Gen. xv. 18, "The same day, the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, 'Unto thy seed will I give this land.'" But this is much more explicitly related in the 17th chapter, ver. 1, &c. "The Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God: walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abraham fell on his face; and God talked with him, saying. As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a Father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham: for a Father of many nations have I made thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.—Every man-child among you shall be circumcised,—it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.—The uncircumcised man-child shall be cut off; he hath broken my covenant." So we see, this original covenant, though *everlasting*, was conditional, and man's failing in the condition, cleared God.

LXIV. We have St. Paul's account of this covenant of God with Abraham, in Romans iv. 3, &c. "Abraham," saith he, "believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." (This was a little before God established his covenant with him, and is related, Gen. xv. 6.) "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed to them also: and the Father of circumcision, (i. e. of them that are circumcised,) to them who are not of the circumcision only, but also walk in the steps of that faith of our Father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised." Now, if these words do not express a conditional covenant, certainly none can.

LXV. The nature and ground of this covenant of God with Abraham is farther explained, Gen. xviii. 19, &c. "And the Lord said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; seeing all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children, and his household after him: and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

Does God say here, *I will do it, because I will?* Nothing less. The reason is explicitly assigned: "All nations shall be blessed in him: For he will command his children, and they shall keep the way of the Lord."

The reason is yet more (clearly, it cannot, but more) fully set down in ch. xxii. 16, &c. "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, BECAUSE thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: that in blessing I will bless thee,—and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" (that is, the Messiah shall spring from thee) BECAUSE *thou hast obeyed my voice*.

This is yet again declared, (chap. xxvi. 2, &c.) "And the Lord appeared unto Isaac, and said,—Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and bless thee: for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will perform the oath, which I sware unto Abraham thy father. In thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed: BECAUSE that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws."

LXVI. This covenant, made to Abraham and his seed, is mentioned again, Exod. xix. 3, &c. "And the Lord called unto Moses, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel, Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people."

In the following chapter, God declares the terms of the covenant they were to keep, in ten commandments. And these themselves are sometimes termed, *The Covenant*: sometimes, *The Book of the Covenant*. So chap. xxiv. 4, &c. after God had made an end of speaking to the people, it is said, "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning,—and he took the book of

the covenant, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do. And Moses took the blood (of the burnt-offering) and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."

After the people had broken this covenant, by worshipping the golden calf, God renews it, chap. xxxiv. where we read (ver. 27, 28,) "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words, for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel, and he wrote upon the tables, the words of the covenant," the Ten Commandments.

LXVII. According to the tenor of this covenant, made to Abraham and his seed, God afterwards declares (Lev. xxvi. 3, &c.) "If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments and do them, then I will establish my covenant with you, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people:—But if ye will not hearken unto me, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my covenant, I will set my face against you, and I will avenge the quarrel of my covenant:—Yet if they shall confess their iniquity, and if their uncircumcised hearts be humbled,—then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember." Consequently, the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was conditional, as well as that with their posterity.

LXVIII. "But is not the Faithfulness of God engaged to keep all that now believe from falling away?" I cannot say that. Whatever assurance God may give to particular souls, I find no general promise in Holy Writ, "That none who once believe shall finally fall." Yet, to say the truth, this is so pleasing an opinion, so agreeable to flesh and blood, so suitable to whatever of nature remains in those who have tasted the grace of God, that I see nothing but the mighty power of God, which can restrain any one who hears it from closing with it. But still it wants one thing to recommend it, plain, cogent, Scripture-proof.

Arguments from experience alone will never determine this point. They can only prove thus much, on the one hand, that our Lord is exceeding patient, that he is peculiarly unwilling any believer should perish; that he bears long, very long with all their follies, waiting to be gracious, and to heal their backsiding; and that he does actually bring back many lost sheep, who, to man's apprehensions, were irrecoverable: but all this does not amount to a convincing proof, that no believer can or does fall from grace. So that this argument from experience will weigh little with those who believe the possibility of falling.

And it will weigh full as little with those who do not. For if you produce ever so many examples of those who were once strong in faith, and are now more abandoned than ever, they will evade it by saying, "O, but they will be brought back; they will not die in their sins." And if they do die in their sins, we come no nearer;

we have not gained one point still. For it is easy to say, 'They were only hypocrites: they never had true faith.' " Therefore Scripture alone can determine this question. And Scripture does so fully determine it, that there needs only to set down a very few texts, with some short reflections upon them.

LXIX. That one who is a true believer, or, in other words, one who is holy or righteous in the judgment of God himself, may nevertheless finally fall from grace, appears, 1. From the word of God by Ezekiel, (ch. xviii. 24.) "When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die."

Do you object,* "This chapter relates wholly and solely to the Jewish church and nation?" I answer, Prove this: till then I shall believe that many parts of it concern all mankind.

If you say, 2. "The righteousness spoken of in this chapter, was merely an outward righteousness, without any inward principle of grace or holiness: I ask, How is this consistent with the 31st verse, "Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart, and a new spirit?" Is this a "merely outward righteousness, without any inward principle of grace or holiness?"

Will you add, "But admitting the person here spoken of to be a truly righteous man, what is here said is only a supposition." That I flatly deny. Read over the chapter again, and you will see the facts there laid down, to be not barely *supposed*, but expressly *asserted*.

That the death here mentioned is eternal death, appears from the 26th verse. "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, (here is temporal death,) for his iniquity that he hath done, he shall die." Here is death eternal.

If you assert, "Both these expressions signify the same thing, and not two different deaths:" you put a palpable force upon the text, in order to make the Holy Ghost speak nonsense. "Dying in *his iniquity* (you say) is the same thing as dying *for his iniquity*." Then the text means thus, "When he dieth in them, he shall die in them." A very deep discovery!

But you say, "It cannot be understood of eternal death: because they might be delivered from it by repentance and reformation." And why might they not by such repentance as is mentioned in the 31st verse, be delivered from eternal death?

But the whole chapter, you think "has nothing to do with the spiritual and eternal affairs of men."

I believe every impartial man will think quite the contrary, if he reads calmly either the beginning of it: "All souls are mine, saith

* See a Pamphlet entitled, The Doctrine of the Saints' Final Perseverance, Asserted and Vindicated.

the Lord God: the soul that sinneth it shall die; (where I can by no means allow that by the death of the soul is meant only a temporal affliction;) or the conclusion, "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart, and a new spirit, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" It remains then, that one who is righteous in the judgment of God himself, may finally fall from grace.

LXX. Secondly, That one who is endued with the faith, which produces a good conscience, may, nevertheless, finally fall, appears from the words of St. Paul to Timothy, (1 Tim. i. 18, 19.) "War a good warfare, holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck."

Observe, 1. These men had once the faith that produces a *good conscience*, which they once had, or they could not have *put it away*.

Observe, 2. They *made shipwreck* of the faith, which necessarily implies the total and final loss of it.

You object, "Nay, the *putting away* a good conscience does not suppose they had it, but rather that they had it not."

This is really surprising. But how do you prove it? "Why by Acts xiii. 46, where St. Paul says to the Jews, 'It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you. But seeing ye put it from you—lo, we turn to the Gentiles.' Here you see the Jews, who never had the gospel, are said to *put it away*."

How! are you sure they "never had, what they are here said to *put away*?" Not so; what they put away, it is undeniable they had till they *put it away*: namely, *the word of God spoken* by Paul and Barnabas. This instance, therefore, makes full against you. It proves just the reverse of what you cited it for.

But you object further, "Men may have a *good conscience* in some sense, without true faith."

I grant it, in a restrained, limited sense; but not a *good conscience*, simply and absolutely speaking. But such is that of which the Apostle here speaks, and which he exhorts Timothy to *hold fast*. Unless you apprehend, that the *holding it fast* likewise "rather supposes he never had it."

"But the faith here mentioned means only the doctrine of faith." I want better proof of this.

It remains then, that one who has the faith that produces a good conscience, may yet finally fall.

LXXI. Thirdly, Those who are grafted into the good olive-tree, the spiritual, invisible church, may nevertheless finally fall. For thus saith the Apostle, "Some of the branches are broken off, and thou art grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree. Be not high-minded, but fear: if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee. Behold the goodness and severity of God! on them which fell, severity, but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou shalt be cut off." Rom. xi. 17, &c.

We may observe here, 1. The persons spoken to were actually engrafted into the olive-tree :

2. This olive-tree is not barely the outward, visible church, but the invisible, consisting of holy believers. So the text. "If the first-fruit be holy, the lump is holy ; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." And, "because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith."

3. Those holy believers were still liable to be cut off from the invisible church, into which they were then grafted.

4. Here is not the least intimation of their being ever grafted in again.

To this you object, 1. "This olive-tree is not the invisible church, but only the outward gospel church state." You *affirm* this ; and I *prove* the contrary ; namely, that it is the invisible church: for it "consists of holy believers, which none but the invisible church does."

You object, 2. "The Jews who were broken off, were never true believers in Christ."

I am not speaking of the Jews, but of those Gentiles who are mentioned in the 22d verse ; whom St. Paul exhorts to "continue in his goodness :" otherwise, saith he, "thou shalt be cut off." Now, I presume, these were true believers in Christ. Yet they were still liable to be *cut off*.

You assert, 3. "This is only a cutting-off from the outward church state." But how is this proved ? So forced and unnatural a construction requires some argument to support it.

You say, 4. "There is a strong intimation that they shall be grafted in again." No. Not that those Gentiles, who "did not continue in his goodness," should be grafted in, after they were once cut off. I cannot find the least intimation of this. "But *all Israel shall be saved.*" I believe they will : but this does not imply the re-ingrafting of these Gentiles.—It remains then, that those who are grafted into the spiritual, invisible church, may nevertheless finally fall.

LXXII. Fourthly, Those who are branches of Christ, the true vine, may yet finally fall from grace. For thus saith our blessed Lord himself, "I am the true Vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away I am the vine, ye are the branches. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." John xv. 1, &c.

Here we may observe, 1. The persons spoken of, were *in Christ.* branches of the true vine :

2. Some of these branches abide not in Christ, but "the Father taketh them away :"

3. The branches which abide not are cast forth, cast out from Christ and his church.

4. They are not only cast forth, but withered, consequently never grafted in again.

5. They are not only cast forth, and withered, but also cast into the fire : And,

6. *They are burned.* It is not possible for words more strong to declare, that those who are branches of the true Vine may finally fall.

“But this, you say, furnishes an argument for, not against, the persevering of the saints.”

Yes, just such an argument for final perseverance, as the above-cited words of St. Paul to Timothy.

But how do you make it out? Why thus. “There are two sorts of branches in Christ the vine: the one fruitful, the other unfruitful. The one are eternally chosen, and these abide in him, and can never withdraw away.” Nay, this is the very point to be proved. So that you now, immediately and directly, beg the question.

“The other sort of branches are such as are in Christ only by profession: who get into churches, and so are reckoned in Christ, and these in time wither away. These never had any life, grace, or fruitfulness from him.”

Surely you do not offer this by way of argument! You are again taking for granted the very point to be proved.

But you will prove, that “those are branches in Christ, who *never had any life or grace from him*, because the churches of Judca and Thessalonica are said to be in Christ, though every individual member was not savingly in him.” I deny the consequence, which can never be made good, unless you can prove, that those very Jews or Thessalonians, who never had any life or grace from him, are nevertheless said by our Lord to be branches in him.

It remains, that true believers, who are branches of the true vine, may nevertheless finally fall.

LXXXIII. Fifthly, Those who so effectually know Christ, as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world, may yet fall back into those pollutions, and perish everlastingily. For thus saith the Apostle Peter, “If after they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” (the only possible way of escaping them,) “they are entangled again therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.” 2 Pet. ii. 20, 21.

But you say, 1. “Their knowledge was not an experimental knowledge.” And how do you prove this? “Because, had it been such, they could not have lost it.” You are begging the question again.

You say, 2. “*Escaping the pollutions of the world*, signifies no more than an outward reformation.” How prove you that? You aim at no proof at all. But he that will grant it, may.

You say, 3. “These persons never had any change wrought upon them. They were no other than dogs and swine, not only before and after, but even while they outwardly abstained from gross enormities.”

I grant, that before and after that time, during which they “escaped the pollutions of the world,” (or as St. Peter words it in his

former Epistle, “The corruption that is in the world,”) they might well be termed either dogs or swine, for their gross enormities. But that they deserved such an appellation during that time, I cannot grant without some proof.

It remains, that those who, by the inward knowledge of Christ, have escaped the pollutions of the world, may yet fall back into those pollutions, and perish everlastingily.

LXXIV Sixthly, Those who see the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, of the witness, and the fruits of the Spirit, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlastingily.

For thus saith the writer to the Hebrews,—“It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost,—If they fall away, to renew them again to repentance ; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.”

Must not every unprejudiced person see, the expressions here used are so strong and clear, that they cannot, without gross and palpable wresting, be understood of any but true believers ?

But the Apostle makes only a supposition, “*If they shall fall away?*”

The Apostle makes no supposition at all. There is no *if* in the original. The words are, *Ἄδηλοις γαρ τοις αποξ θωτοῖς επανεπονητοῖς*. That is, in plain English, “It is impossible to renew again unto repentance those who were once enlightened, *and have fallen away.*”

“No. The words in the original lie literally thus. *It is impossible for those who were once enlightened,—and they falling away, to renew them again unto repentance :* that is, should they fall away, which is in plain English, *If they fall away.*”

Excuse me for speaking plain English here. “Shall a man lie for God?” Either you or I do ; for I flatly aver, (and let all, that understand Greek, judge between us,) that the words in the original do not lie literally thus, *And they falling away*, (if so, they must be *καὶ παρπατήσεις*, in the *present* tense ; not *καὶ παρπερούσεις*, in the *indefinite*,) but that they are translated, *And have fallen away* ; as literally as the English tongue will bear.

Therefore here is no *if* in the case, no supposition at all, but a plain declaration of matter of fact.

LXXV “But why do you imagine these persons were true believers?” Because all the expressions, in their easy, natural sense, imply it.

They were once enlightened : an expression familiar with the Apostle, and never by him applied to any but believers. So “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation,—The cyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling,—And what is the exceeding greatness of his power, to us-ward that believe.” Eph. i. 17.

&c. So again, “God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” 2 Cor. iv. 6

“Nay, *they were enlightened*, means only, they were *baptized*; or knew the doctrines of the gospel.”

I cannot believe this, till you bring me a few passages from St. Paul’s writings, wherein that expression is evidently taken in either of these senses.

Again. They “had tasted of the heavenly gift” (emphatically so called) “and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.” So St. Peter likewise couples them together, Acts ii. 38, “Be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Whereby the love of God was shed abroad in their hearts, with all the other fruits of the Spirit.

The expression, they “had *tasted* of the heavenly gift,” is taken from the Psalmist, “Taste and see that the Lord is good.” As if he had said, Be ye as assured of his love, as of any thing you see with your eyes. And let the assurance thereof be sweet to your soul, as the honey is to your tongue.

“But this means only, they had some notions of remission of sins and heaven, and some desires after them. And they had received the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost.” This you *affirm*; but without any colour of proof.

It remains, that those who “see the light of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ,” and who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, of the witness and the fruits of the Spirit, may nevertheless so fall from God as to perish everlasting.

LXXVI. Seventhly, Those who live by faith may yet fall from God, and perish everlasting.

For thus saith the Apostle, “The just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.” Heb. x. 38. *The just*, (the justified person, of whom only this can be said) *shall live by faith*, even now shall live the life which is hid with Christ in God; and if he endure unto the end, shall live with God for ever. “But if any man draw back, saith the Lord, my soul shall have no pleasure in him;” that is, I will utterly cast him off. and accordingly the drawing back here spoken of, is termed in the verse immediately following, “drawing back to perdition.”

“But the person supposed to draw back, is not the same with him, that is said to live by faith.”

I answer, 1. Who is it then? Can any man draw back from faith, who never came to it? 2. But had the text been fairly translated, there had been no pretence for this objection. For the original runs thus:—*Ο δικαιος εν πιστει ζητεται και εαν ουποειληφαι*—If ‘*ο δικαιος*, *the just man that lives by faith*, (so the expression necessarily implies, there being no other nominative to the verb) *draw back*, *my soul shall have no pleasure in him*.

“But your translation too is inaccurate.” Be pleased to show me wherein?

“ I grant he may draw back ; and yet not draw back to perdition.” But then it is not the drawing back which is here spoken of.

“ However, here is only a supposition, which proves no fact.” I observe you take that as a general rule, Suppositions prove no facts. But this is not true. They do not always ; but many times they do. And whether they do or not in a particular text, must be judged from the nature of the supposition, and from the preceding and following words.

“ But the inserting *any man* into the text, is agreeable to the grammatical construction of the words.” This I totally deny. There is no need of any such insertion. The preceding *nominative* suffices.

“ But one that lives by faith, cannot draw back. For *whom he justified, them he also glorified.*”

This proves no more than that all who are glorified, are pardoned and sanctified first.

“ Nay, but St. Paul says, ‘ Ye are dead ; and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is your life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.’ ”

Most sure, if you endure to the end. “ Whosoever believeth in him” to the end “ shall never die.”

LXXVII. “ But, to come more home to the point, I say, this text is so far from militating against perseverance, that it greatly establishes it.”

You are very unhappy in your choice of texts to establish this doctrine. Two of these establish it just as this does, as we have seen already. Now pray let us hear how you prove perseverance from this text.

“ Very easily. Here are two sorts of persons mentioned ; he that lives by faith, and he that draws back to perdition.”

Nay, this is the very question. I do not allow that two persons are mentioned in the text. I have shown it is one and the same person, who once lived by faith, and afterwards draws back.

Yet thus much I allow : two sorts of believers are in the next verse mentioned ; some that draw back, and some that persevere. And I allow, the Apostle adds, “ We are not of them that draw back unto perdition.” But what will you infer from thence ? This is so far from contradicting what has been observed before, that it manifestly confirms it, it is a farther proof that there are those who draw back unto perdition, although these were not of that number.

“ I must still aver, that the text is rightly translated : which I prove thus :—

“ The original text (Hab. ii. 4.) runs thus : ‘ Behold his soul who is lifted up, is not upright in him ; but the just shall live by his faith.’ ”

“ This the Seventy render, Εάν ουτοσειληθαι, οὐ ευδοκει η ψυχη με εν αὐτω· ο δε διχαιος εκ πιστως με ζετεται, If a man draw back, my soul hath no pleasure in him. But the just shall live by my faith, (i. e. faith in me.)

“ Now here the man in the former clause who *draws back*, is distinguished from him in the following clause, who *lives by faith*.

“ But the Apostle quotes the text from this translation.”

True ; but he does not distinguish the man in the former clause, who *draws back*, from him in the latter who *lives by faith*. So far from it, that he quite inverts the order of the sentence, placing the latter clause of it first. And by this mean it comes to pass, that although in translating this text from the *Septuagint*, we must insert *a man* (because there is no *nominative* preceding) yet in translating it from the Apostle, there is no need or pretence for inserting it, seeing *τὸν ἀνθρώπον* stands just before.

Therefore such an insertion is a palpable violence to the text : which consequently is not rightly translated.

It remains, that those who live by faith, may yet fall from God, and perish everlastingily.

LXXVIII. Eighthly, Those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant, may so fall as to perish everlastingily.

For thus again saith the Apostle : “ If we sin wilfully, after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin ; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’s law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing.”

It is undeniably plain, 1. That the person mentioned here was once sanctified by the blood of the covenant : 2. That he afterwards, by known wilful sin, trod under foot the Son of God : and, 3. That he hereby incurred a sorer punishment than death, namely, death everlasting.

“ Nay, the immediate antecedent to the relative *he*, is the Son of God. Therefore it was he, not the apostate who was sanctified (separately for his priestly office) by the blood of the covenant.”

Either you forget to look at the original, or your memory fails. The Son of God, is not the immediate antecedent to the relative *he*. The words run thus : “ Of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God. *εἰς τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθῆκης κοίτος μνηστευτός*, εἰς τὸ μνηστήριον. You see *μνηστευτός* not *εἰς*, is the immediate antecedent to the relative *he*. Consequently it is the apostate, not the son of God, who is here said to be sanctified.

“ If he were sanctified, yet this cannot be understood of inward sanctification. Therefore it must mean, either, that he said he was sanctified ; or that he made an outward profession of religion.”

Why cannot the word be understood in its proper, natural sense, of inward sanctification ?

“ Because that is by the Spirit of God.” From this very consideration it appears, that this must be understood of inward sanctification ; for the words immediately following are, “ and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace,” even that grace whereby *he was* sanctified.

It remains, that those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant, may yet perish everlastingily.

LXXIX. If you imagine these texts are not sufficient to prove that a true believer may finally fall, I will offer a few more to your consideration, which I would beg you to weigh farther at your leisure.

Matt. v. 13, "Ye (Christians) are the salt of the earth. But if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and trodden under foot of men."

Chap. xii. 43, "When the unclean spirit goeth out of a man (as he doth out of every true believer,) he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return,—and he taketh with him seven other spirits,—and they enter in, and dwell there. And the last state of that man is worse than the first."

Chap. xxiv. 10, &c. "And then shall many be offended,—and the love (towards God and man) of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure to the end, the same shall be saved."

Ver. 45, &c. "Who, then, is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household?—But if that evil servant (wise and faithful as he was once) shall begin to smite his fellow-servants,—the Lord shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites," apostates being no better than they.

Luke xxi. 34, "Take heed to yourselves (ye that believe) lest at any time your heart be overcharged with the cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." Plainly implying, that otherwise they would not be "accounted worthy to stand before the Son of Man."

John v. 14, "Sin no more, lest a worst thing (than any temporal evil) come unto thee."

Chap. viii. 31. 33, "If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed. And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

1 Cor. ix. 27, "I keep my body under,—lest, by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away."

1 Cor. x. 3, &c. "Our fathers did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink (for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.) But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness.—Now these things were our examples,—Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

2 Cor. vi. 1, "We, therefore, as workers together with him, beseech you, that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." But this were impossible, if none that ever had it could perish.

Gal. v. 4, "Ye are fallen from grace."—Chap. vi. 9, "We shall reap, if we faint not." Therefore, we shall not reap, if we do.

Heb. iii. 4, "We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end."

2 Pet. iii. 17, "Beware, lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness."

2 John 8, "Look to yourselves, that we lose not the things which we have wrought."

Rev. iii. 11, "Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." And to conclude,

"So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye, from your hearts, forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." Matt. xviii. 35. So ! How ? He will retract the pardon he had given, and deliver you to the tormentors.

LXXX. "Why then, you make salvation conditional." I *make* it neither conditional nor unconditional. But I *declare* just what I find in the Bible, neither more nor less ; namely, that it is bought for every child of man, and actually given to every one that believeth. If you call this condition salvation, God *made* it so from the beginning of the world : and he hath *declared* it so to be, at sundry times, and in diver manners ; of old by Moses and the Prophets. and in latter times by Christ and his Apostles.

"Then I can never be saved ; for I can perform no conditions ; for I can do nothing." No, nor I ; nor any man under heaven,—without the grace of God. But "I can do all things through Christ strengthening me." So can you. So can every believer. And he *has* strengthened, and will strengthen you more and more, if you do not wilfully resist, till you quench his Spirit.

LXXXI. "Nay, but God must work *irresistibly* in me, or I shall never be saved." Hold ! consider that word. You are again advancing a doctrine which has not one plain, clear text to support it. I allow, God *may* possibly at *some times*, work irresistibly in *some* souls. I believe he *does*. But can you infer from hence, that he *always* works thus in all that are saved ? Alas, my brother, what kind of conclusion is this ? And by what scripture will you prove it ? Where, I pray, is it written, that none are saved but by irresistible grace ? By almighty grace, I grant ; by that power alone, to which all things are possible. But show me any one plain scripture for this, That "all saving grace is irresistible."

LXXXII. But this doctrine is not only unsupported by Scripture. It is flatly contrary thereto. How will you reconcile it, to instance in a very few, with the following texts ?

Matt. xxii. 3, &c. "He sent to call them, and they would not come."

Mark vi. 5, "He could do no mighty works there, because of their unbelief."

Luke v. 17, "There were Pharisees, and the power of the Lord was present to heal them." Nevertheless they were not healed in fact, as the words immediately following show. Chap. vii. 29, "The Pharisees and lawyers made void the counsel of God against themselves." Chap. xiii. 34, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children, and ye would not."

John vi. 63, &c. "It is the spirit that quickeneth ; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit. But there are some of you that believe not." Therefore that Spirit did not work irresistibly.

Acts vii. 41, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." Chap. xiii. 46, "Ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life."

Heb. iii. 8, "While it is called to-day, harden not your heart." Ibid. ver. 12, "Take heed lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from a living God." Chap. xii. 25, "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh."

LXXXIII. I do but just give you a specimen of the innumerable scriptures which might be produced on this head. And why will you adhere to an opinion not only unsupported by, but utterly contrary both to Reason and Scripture? Be pleased to observe here also, that you are not to consider the doctrine of irresistible grace by itself, any more than that of unconditional election, or final perseverance: but as it stands in connection with unconditional reprobation, that mill-stone which hangs about the neck of your whole hypothesis.

Will you say, "I adhere to it because of its usefulness?" Wherein does that usefulness lie? "It exalts God, and debases man." If what sense does it exalt God? God in himself is exalted above all praise. Your meaning therefore I suppose is this: it displays to others how highly he is exalted in justice, mercy, and truth. But the direct contrary of this has been shown at large: It has been shown by various considerations, that God is not exalted, but rather dishonoured, and that in the highest degree, by supposing him to despise the work of his own hands, the far greater part of the souls which he hath made. And as to the debasing man; if you mean, "This opinion truly humbles the men that hold it," I fear it does not: I have not perceived (and I have had large occasion to make the trial) that all or even the generality of them that hold it, are more humble than other men. Neither, I think, will you say, that none are humble, who hold it not: so that it is neither a *necessary* nor a *certain* mean of humility. And if it be so sometimes, this only proves that God can bring good out of evil.

LXXXIV The truth is, neither this opinion nor that, but the love of God humbles man, and that only. Let but this be shed abroad in his heart, and he abhors himself in dust and ashes. As soon as this enters into his soul, lowly shame covers his face. That thought, What is God? What hath he done for *me*? is immediately followed by, What am I? And he knoweth not what to do, or where to hide, or how to abase himself enough before the great God of love, of whom he now knoweth, that "as his majesty is, so is his mercy." Let him who has *felt* this, (whatever be his opinion,) say, whether he could then take glory to himself? Whether he could ascribe to himself any part of his salvation, or the glory of any good word or thought? Lean, then, who will, on that broken reed for humility; but let the love of God humble my soul!

LXXXV. "Why, this is the very thing which recommends it. This doctrine makes men love God." I answer, as before: accidentally it may; because God can draw good out of evil. But you will not say, All who hold it, love God; so it is no certain mean to that end. Nor will you say, That none love him who hold it not. Neither therefore is it a necessary mean. But indeed when you talk at all of its "making men love God," you know not what you do. You lead men into more danger than you are aware of. You almost unavoidably lead them into *resting* on that opinion: you cut them off from a true dependence on the Fountain of living waters, and strengthen them in hewing to themselves broken cisterns which can hold no water.

LXXXVI. This is my grand objection to the doctrine of reprobation, or (which is the same) unconditional election. That it is an error, I know; because if this were true, the whole Scripture must be false. But it is not only for this, because it is an error, that I so earnestly oppose it, but because it is an error of so pernicious consequences to the souls of men; because it directly and naturally tends to hinder the inward work of God in every stage of it.

LXXXVII. For instance; is a man careless and unconcerned? utterly dead in trespasses and sins? Exhort him then (suppose he is of your own opinion) to take some care of his immortal soul. "I take care!" says he, "what signifies *my* care? why, what must be, *must* be. If I am elect, I must be saved; and if I am not, I must be damned." And the reasoning is as just and strong as it is obvious and natural. It avails not to say, "Men may *abuse* any doctrine." So they may. But this is not *abusing* your's. It is the plain, natural *use* of it. The premises cannot be denied, (on your scheme,) and the consequence is equally clear and undeniable. Is he a little serious and thoughtful now and then, though generally cold and lukewarm? press him then to stir up the gift that is in him, to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling. Alas! says he, what can I do? you know man can do nothing. If you reply, But you do not *desire* salvation; you are not willing to be saved. It may be so, says he, but God shall make me willing in the day of his power. So waiting for irresistible grace, he falls faster asleep than ever. See him again, when he thoroughly awakes out of sleep; when, in spite of his principles, fearfulness and trembling are come upon him, and a horrible dread hath overwhelmed him. How then will you comfort one who is well nigh swallowed up of overmuch sorrow? If at all, by applying the promises of God. But against these he is fenced on every side. These, indeed, says he, are great and precious promises; but they belong to the elect only. Therefore they are nothing to me. I am not of that number, and I never can be: for his decree is unchangeable. Has he already tasted of the good word, and the powers of the world to come? being justified by faith, hath he peace with God? then sin hath no dominion over him. But by and by, considering he may fall *fouly* indeed, but cannot fall *finally*, he is not so jealous over himself as he was at first, he grows

a little and a little slackner, till ere long he falls again into the sin from which he was clean escaped. As soon as you perceive he is entangled again and overcome, you apply the scriptures relating to that state. You conjure him not to harden his heart any more, lest his last state be worse than the first. "How can that be?" says he, "once in grace, always in grace; and I am sure I was in grace once. You shall never tear away my shield." So he sins on, and sleeps on, till he awakes in hell!

LXXXVIII. The observing these melancholy examples day by day, this dreadful havoc which the Devil makes of souls, especially of those who had begun to run well, by means of this antisciptural doctrine, constrains me to oppose it from the same principle, whereon I labour to save souls from destruction. Nor is it sufficient to ask, Are there not also many who *wrest* the opposite doctrine to their own destruction? If there are, that is nothing to the point in question; for that is not the case here. Here is no *wresting* at all: the doctrine of absolute predestination naturally leads to the chambers of death.

Let an instance in each kind be proposed, and the difference is so broad, he that runneth may read it. I say, "Christ died for all. He tasted death for every man, and he willeth all men to be saved." "O," says a hearer, "then I can be saved when I will; so I may safely sin a little longer." No, this is no consequence from what I said: the words are *wrested* to infer what does not follow. You say, "Christ died only for the elect: and all these must and shall be saved." "O," says a hearer, "then, if I am one of the elect, I must and shall be saved; therefore I may safely sin a little longer; for my salvation cannot fail." Now this is a fair consequence from what you said; the words are not wrested at all. No more is inferred than what plainly and undeniably follows from the premises. And the very same observation may be made on every article of that doctrine. Every branch of it, as well as this, (however the wisdom of God may sometimes draw good out of it,) has a natural, genuine tendency, without any wrestling, either to prevent or obstruct holiness.

LXXXIX. Brethren, would ye lie for the cause of God? I am persuaded ye would not. Think then that as ye are, so am I: I speak the truth, before God, my Judge: not of those who were trained up therein, but of those who were lately brought over to your opinion. Many of these have I known, but I have not known one in ten of all that number, in whom it did not speedily work some of the above-named effects, according to the state of soul they were then in. And one only have I known among them all, after the closest and most impartial observation, who did not evidently show, within one year, that his heart was changed, not for the better, but for the worse.

XC. I know indeed ye cannot easily believe this. But whether ye believe it or not, you believe, as well as I, that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. May we not then, at least, join in this

In declaring the nature of inward holiness, and testifying to all the necessity of it? May we not all thus far join, in tearing away the broken reeds whereon so many rest, without either inward or outward holiness, and which they idly trust will supply its place? As far as is possible, let us join in destroying the works of the Devil, and in setting up the kingdom of God upon earth, in promoting righteousness, peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost.

Of whatever opinion or denomination we are, we must serve either God or the Devil. If we serve God our agreement is far greater than our difference. Therefore, as far as may be, setting aside the difference, let us unite in destroying the works of the Devil, in bringing all we can from the power of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. And let us assist each other to value more and more the glorious grace whereby we stand, and daily to grow in that grace, and in the knowledge of our **LORD JESUS CHRIST.**

THE
SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE
CONCERNING
PREDESTINATION, ELECTION,
AND
REPROBATION.

“Therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe.” 1 Tim. iv. 10.

1. THE Scripture saith, “God hath chosen us in Christ, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love.” (Eph. i. 4.) And St. Peter calls the saints, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience.” (1 Pet. i. 2.) And St. Paul saith unto them, “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth; whereunto he hath called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (2 Thess. ii. 13, 14.)

2. From all these places of Scripture, it is plain that God hath chosen some to life and glory, before or from the foundation of the

world. And the wisdom of all Christians is, to labour that their judgments may be informed herein, according to the Scripture. And to that end let us consider the manner of God's speaking to the sons of men.

3. God saith to Abraham, "As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations, before him whom he believed, even God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth things that are not as though they were." (Rom. iv. 17.) Observe, God speaks then, at that present time, to Abraham, saying, "I have made thee a father of many nations," notwithstanding Abraham was not at that time the father of one child, but Ishmael. How then must we understand, "I have made thee a father of many nations?"

4. The Apostle tells us plainly, it was so, "Before God, who calleth things that are not, as though they were." And so he called Abraham, "The father of many nations," though he was not as yet the father even of Isaac, "in whom his seed was to be called."

5. God useth the same manner of speaking, when he calleth Christ, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," (Rev. xiii. 8;) although indeed he was not slain for several thousands of years after. Here therefore we may easily understand what he speaketh of "electing us from the foundation of the world."

6. God calleth Abraham "a father of many nations," though not so at that time. He calleth Christ "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," though not slain till he was a man in the flesh. Even so he calleth men "elected from the foundation of the world," though not elected till they were men in the flesh. Yet it is all so before God, who knoweth all things from eternity, and " calleth things that are not, as though they were."

7. By all which it is clear, that as Christ was called "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and yet not slain till several thousands of years after; so also men are called "Elect from the foundation of the world," and yet are not elected perhaps till several thousands of years after, till the day of their conversion to God.

8. And indeed this is plain without going farther, from those very words of St. Peter, "Elect according to the fore-knowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience." For, If the Elect are chosen through the sanctification of the Spirit, then they were not chosen before they were sanctified by the Spirit. But they were not sanctified by the Spirit, before they had a being. It is plain then, either were they chosen from the foundation of the world. But "God calleth things that are not, as though they were."

9. This is also plain from those words of St. Paul, "God hath from the beginning chosen you unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." Now,

If the saints are chosen to salvation, through believing of the truth, and were called to believe that truth by hearing of the gospel, then they were not chosen before they believed the truth, and before they heard the gospel, whereby they were called to believe. But they were chosen through belief of the truth, and called to

believe it by the gospel. Therefore they were not chosen before they believed: much less before they had a being, any more than Christ was slain before he had a being. So plain it is, that they were not elected, till they believed; although "God calleth things that are not, as though they were."

10. Again, how plain is it, where St. Paul saith, that they whom "God did predestinate, according to the counsel of his own will, to be to the praise of his glory," were such as did "first trust in Christ?" (Eph. i. 11, 12.) And in the very next verse, he saith; that they "trusted in Christ after they heard the word of truth," (not before.) But they did not hear the word before they were born. Therefore, it is plain, the act of election is "in time," though known of God before; who, according to his knowledge, often speaketh of the things "which are not, as though they were." And thus is the great stumbling-block about Election taken away, that men may "make their calling and election sure."

11. The Scripture tells us as plainly what predestination is: It is God's fore-appointing obedient believers to salvation, not without, but "according to his fore-knowledge" of all their works, "from the foundation of the world." And so likewise he predestinates or fore-appoints all disobedient unbelievers to damnation," not without, but "according to his fore-knowledge" of all their works, "from the foundation of the world."

12. We may consider this a little farther. "God, from the foundation of the world, foreknew all men's believing or not believing. And according to this his fore-knowledge, he chose or *elected* all obedient believers, as such, to salvation, and refused or *reprobated* all disobedient unbelievers, as such, to damnation. Thus the Scriptures teach us to consider *Election* and *Reprobation* "according to the fore-knowledge of God from the foundation of the world."

13. But here some may object, that I hold our faith and obedience to be the cause of God's electing us to glory.

I answer, I do hold, that faith in Christ producing obedience to him is *a cause without which* God electeth none to glory; for we never read of God's electing to glory, any who lived and died a disobedient unbeliever. But I do not hold, that it is *the cause for which* he elects any: the contrary of this is easily shown, thus:

Suppose my obedience is a cause of my election to salvation, what is the cause of my obedience? Ans. My love to Christ.

But what is the cause of my love to Christ? Ans. My faith in Christ.

But what is the cause of my faith in Christ? Ans. The preaching of the gospel of Christ.

But what is the cause of the preaching the gospel to us? Ans. Christ's dying for us.

But what is the cause of Christ's dying for us? Ans. God's great love of pity wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in trespasses and sins.

14. Thus all men may see, that I do not hold, God chose any man to life and salvation, for any good which he had done, or for any

which was in him, before he put it there. And this I shall now show more at large from the oracles of God.

1. God's great love of pity wherewith he loved the sons of men, even while they were dead in trespasses and sins, was the cause of his sending his Son to die for them ; as appears from the following scriptures : " God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, to the end that all who believe in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John. iii. 16.) For " when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly." (Rom. v. 6, &c.) And, " God commendeth his love to us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

2. Christ's dying for our sins is the cause of the gospel's being preached to us, as appears from these scriptures, " Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations." (Matt. xxviii. 18.) " Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark xvi. 15.)

3. The gospel's being preached to sinners is the cause of their believing, as appears from those scriptures, " How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed ? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard ? And how shall they hear without a preacher ? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. x. 15, &c.)

4. Men's believing is the cause of their justification, as appears from these scriptures, " By him all that believe are justified from all things." (Acts xiii. 39.) " He is the justifier of all that believe in Jesus. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 26, &c.) " Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him ; but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus from the dead ; who was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification." (Rom. iv. 3. 23, &c.)

5. Our knowing ourselves justified by faith, is the cause of our love to Christ, as appears from these scriptures ; " Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." (1 John iv. 10.) " We love him, because he first loved us." (1 John iv. 19.)

6. Our love to Christ is the cause of our obeying him, as appears from those scriptures, " If ye love me, keep my commandments. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." (John xiv. 15. 21, &c.) And, " If any man love me, he will keep my words. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." (1 John v. 3.)

7. Our obeying Christ is the cause of his giving us eternal life, as appears from those scriptures, " Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven : but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. vii. 21.) " Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

(Rev. xxii. 14:) And, "Christ being made perfect through sufferings, he became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him." (Heb. v. 9.).

15. This may be more briefly expressed thus:

1. God's love was the cause of his sending his Son to die for sinners.

2. Christ's dying for sinners is the cause of the gospel's being preached.

3. The preaching of the gospel is the cause (or means) of our believing.

4. Our believing is the cause (or condition) of our justification.

5. The knowing ourselves justified through his blood, is the cause of our love to Christ.

6. Our love to Christ is the cause of our obedience to him.

7. Our obedience to Christ is the cause of his becoming the Author of eternal salvation to us.

16. These following things therefore ought well to be considered by all that fear God.

1. There was a necessity of God's love in sending his Son to die for us, without which he had not come to die.

2. There was a necessity of Christ's love in dying for us, without which the gospel could not have been preached.

3. There was a necessity of the gospel's being preached, without which there could have been no believing.

4. There is a necessity of our believing the gospel, without which we cannot be justified.

5. There is a necessity of our being justified by faith in the blood of Christ, without which we cannot come to know that he "loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

6. There is a necessity of our knowing his love, who first loved us, without which we cannot love him again.

7. There is a necessity for our loving him, without which we can not keep his commandments.

8. There is a necessity of our keeping his commandments, without which we cannot enter into eternal life.

By all which we see, that there is as great a necessity of our keeping the commandments of God, as there was of God's sending his Son into the world, or of Christ's dying for our sins.

17. But for whose sins did Christ die? Did he die for *all* men, or but for *some*?

To this also I will answer by the Scriptures, showing, 1. The testimony of the Prophets. 2. Of the Angel of God. 3. Of Christ himself. And, 4. Of his Apostles.

First, the Prophet Isaiah saith thus, "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet did we esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." (Isaiah

lili. 4—6.) Thus Isaiah shows plainly, that the iniquities of all those who went astray, were laid upon Christ. And to him the testimony of all the other prophets agrees: “To him gave all the Prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” (Acts x. 43.) The same saith that great Prophet, John the Baptist, who “came to bear witness of the light, that all men through it might believe.” (John i. 7.) And again, “Behold,” saith he, “the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.” (ver. 29.) Thus have all the Prophets with one consent testified, that God “laid upon Christ the iniquities of all that were gone astray;” that he is “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world;” that “all men through him may believe;” and that “through his name whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins.”

Secondly, The Angel of God testified the same thing, saying, “Fear not; for I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people,” which were, that there was “born unto them a Saviour, even Christ the Lord.” (Luke ii. 10.) By this also it appears, that Christ died for all men. For else it could not have been glad tidings of great joy, to all people; but rather sad tidings to all those for whom he died not.

Thirdly, We come now to the words of Christ himself, who knew his own business better than any man else; and therefore, if his testimony agree with these, we must needs be convinced that they are true. Now he speaks thus, “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.” (John iii. 14, &c.) Thus we see the words of Christ agree with the words of the Prophets; therefore it must needs be owned that Christ died for all.

Fourthly, And now we will hear what the Apostles say concerning this thing. “The love of Christ,” saith the Apostle Paul, “constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again.” (2 Cor. v. 14, &c.) And to Timothy he saith, “There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.) Again, he saith to Titus, “The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared.” (Tit. ii. 11.) And yet again to the Hebrews, “That he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man.” (Heb. ii. 9.) And to this agreeth St. John, witnessing, “He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” (1 John ii. 3.) And again, speaking of himself and the rest of the Apostles, he saith, “We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.” (1 John iv. 14.) Thus we have the testim-

mony of all the Prophets, of the Angel of God, of Christ himself, and of his holy Apostles, all agreeing together in one to prove, that Christ died for all mankind.

18. What then can they, who deny this, say? Why, they commonly say, *all men*, in these scriptures, does not mean *all men*, but only *the elect*; that *every man* here does not mean *every man*, but only every one of the elect; that *the world* does not mean the *whole world*, but only the world of believers; and that *the whole world*, in St. John's words, does not mean *the whole world*, but only, the whole world of the elect.

19. To this shameless, senseless evasion, I answer thus:

If the Scripture no where speaks of a world of believers or elect, then we have no ground, reason, pretence, or excuse, for saying Christ died only for a world of believers, or elect. But the Scripture nowhere speaks of such a world. Therefore we have no ground or pretence for speaking thus.

Nay, the Scripture is so far from calling believers, or elected persons, *the world*, that they are every where in Scripture plainly and expressly distinguished from *the world*. "If ye were of the world," saith Christ, "the world would love its own; but because I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." (John xv. 19.)

20. But let the Scripture itself speak, what world Christ died for. "When we were without strength Christ died for the ungodly. While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." (Rom. v. 6. 10.) From all which we may clearly see, that Christ died for the *world of the ungodly*, for the *world of sinners*, for the *world of his enemies*; the just one for the *world of the unjust*. But the elect, as elect, are not unjust. Therefore he died not for the elect, as elect: but even for that world St. John speaks of, when he says, "the whole world lieth in wickedness."

21. If it be said, "The elect were sinners once as well as others;" I answer, true; but not as *they are elect in Christ*, but as they were *out of Christ*, "without hope, and without God in the world." Therefore, to say that Christ died for the elect, as elect, is absolute nonsense and confusion.

22. To put this matter out of doubt, I would commend these following considerations to all sober-minded men.

1. The Scripture saith, "Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost."

But the elect, as elect, were not lost.

Therefore Christ died not for the elect, as or because they were elect; for that had been to seek and save what was found and saved before.

2. The Scripture saith, Christ died for the *unjust*.

But the elect, as such, are not unjust.

Therefore Christ died not for the elect, as elect; for that had been to justify them who were just before.

3. The Scripture saith, "He came to preach deliverance to the captives."

But the elect, as elect, are not captives; for Christ hath set them free. Therefore he died not for the elect, as elect; for that had been to set them at liberty who were at liberty before.

4. The Scripture saith, "He quickened them who were dead in trespasses and sins, such as were without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, without hope and without God in the world."

But the elect, as such, are not *dead in trespasses and sins*, but *alive unto God*. Neither are they *without Christ*; for they are chosen *in him*: nor are they "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise." But they are "fellow-citizens with the saints, and the household of God."

Therefore Christ died not for the elect, as or because they were elect. For that had been to quicken them that were alive before, and to bring them into covenant who were in covenant before. And thus, by these men's account, our Lord lost his labour of love, and accomplished A SOLEMN NOTHING!

23. Thus having shown the grievous folly of those who say, that *Christ died for none but the elect*, I shall now prove, by undeniable reasons, that *he died for all mankind*.

Reas. 1. Because all the Prophets, the Angel of God, Christ himself, and his holy Apostles, with one consent, affirm it.

Reas. 2. Because there is not one scripture, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Revelation, that denies it, either negatively, by saying, that *he did not die for all*; or affirmatively, by saying, that *he died only for some*.

Reas. 3. Because he himself commanded, that the gospel should be preached to *every creature*.

Reas. 4. *Because he calleth all men, everywhere to repent.*

Reas. 5. Because those who perish are damned for *not believing in the name of the only begotten Son of God*, therefore, he must have died for them. Else they would be damned for *not believing a lie*.

Reas. 6. Because they which are damned might have been saved. For thus saith the word of God, "They received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them strong delusions, to believe a lie, that they all may be damned." (2 Thess. ii. 10.)

Reas. 7. Because some "deny the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." But they could not *deny the Lord that bought them*, if he had not bought them at all.

24. I shall now briefly show the dreadful absurdities that follow from saying, *Christ died only for the elect*.

1. If Christ died not for all, then unbelief is no sin in them that perish; seeing there is not any thing for those men to believe unto salvation, for whom Christ died not.

2. If Christ died not for all men, then it would be a sin in the greatest part of mankind to believe he died *for them*; seeing it would be to believe a lie.

3. If Christ died not for those that are damned, then they are not damned for unbelief. Otherwise, you say, that they are damned for not believing a lie.

4. If Christ died not for all, then those who obey Christ, by going and preaching the gospel to every creature, as glad tidings of grace and peace, of great joy to *all people*, do sin thereby, in that they go to *most people* with a lie in their mouth.

5. If Christ died not for all men, then God is not in earnest "in calling all men every where to repent;" for what good could repentance do those, for whom Christ died not?

6. If Christ died not for all, then why does he say, "He is not willing that any should perish?" Surely he is willing, yea resolved, that most men should perish; else he would have died for them also.

7. How shall "God judge the world by the man Christ Jesus," if Christ did not die for the world? Or how shall he judge them *according to the gospel*, when there was never any gospel or mercy for them?

25. But, say some, "If Christ died for all, why are not all saved?"

I answer, "Because they believe not in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Because God "called, and they refused to answer; he stretched out his hand, and they regarded not; he counselled them, but they would hear none of his counsels;" he reproved them, but they set at naught all his reproofs; they followed after lying vanities, and forsook their own mercies;" they "denied the Lord that bought them, and so brought upon themselves swift destruction;" and "because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, therefore (if you would know wherefore) God gave them up to believe a lie," and to be damned. "How often" (saith our Lord) "would I have gathered you together, and ye would not!" *Ye would not.* Here is the plain reason why all men are not saved. For God promiseth no man salvation, whether he will or not. But leaveth them to everlasting destruction, who will not *believe and obey the gospel*.

26. "Oh, then you are an Arminian! You are a Free-willer! You hold free-will in man!"

I hold nothing but what the Scripture saith; and that you shall give leave to hold. I do not hold, that any man has any will or power of himself, to do any thing that is good; but by the grace of God we may do all things. I have already shown, he hath given Christ for all men. And "he who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?" And what man knoweth not, that, if he make use of all the will and power God hath given him, God will double his talent, and give him more? If any, therefore, desire to have more, let him faithfully improve what he has. Likewise what man is he, who doth not know that he is not condemned, *for not doing what he could not do*, but *for leaving undone what he could have done if he would*. Let any man deny it if he can.

27. "What then, may all men be saved if they will?"

Before I answer this question directly, I shall show, that those

who ask it, are themselves compelled to grant as much freedom of will as we desire to plead for.

For, 1. The Assembly of Divines, in their Confession of Faith, c. 9, do expressly say, "God hath endowed the will of man with that natural liberty, that is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity determined to do good or evil." 2. Mr. Baxter, in the preface of his *Call to the Unconverted*, says, that *Calvin as well as Arminius held free-will*, and that "no man of brains denieth, that man hath a will that is naturally free ; it is free from violence, it is a self-determining principle." Sure here is as much said for free-will, as any man need to say, and perhaps more. For,

The difference between us, is this. They say, *Man hath a will which is naturally free*. We say, *Man hath this freedom of will, not naturally, but by grace*.

We believe, that in the moment Adam fell, he had no freedom of will left ; but that God, when of his own free-grace he gave the promise of a Saviour to him and his posterity, graciously restored to mankind a liberty and power to accept of proffered salvation. And, in all this, man's boasting is excluded ; the whole of that which is good in him, even from the first motion of his will, being of grace and not of nature. And now we come directly to the question, Whether all men may be saved if they will ?

28. To those who have considered what has been premised, I answer, 1. What should hinder them if they be willing ? For, 2. God is not willing that any should perish ; yea, 3. He is willing that all men should be saved. And Christ is willing ; for he came *not to judge the world, but to save the world*. And how did he weep over Jerusalem ! How often would he have gathered them together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but they would not ! And now, what hinders man's salvation, but that same, *They would not* ?

29. They would not, they will not come at Christ's call, and hearken to his reproof, and wait for his counsels, and receive power from on high to live to him who died for them, walking in all his commandments and ordinances blameless, and following him whithersoever he goeth. This way is so narrow that few care to walk therein ; and, therefore, they are not saved, even because they *reject the counsel of God against themselves*. They choose death ; therefore they perish everlasting.

A DIALOGUE
BETWEEN A
PREDESTINARIAN AND HIS FRIEND.

Out of thine own Mouth !

TO ALL PREDESTINARIANS.

1. I AM informed some of you have said that the following quotations are false ; that *these words were not spoken* by these authors : others, that they were not spoken *in this sense* : and others, that neither you yourself, nor any *true Predestinarian* ever *did*, or ever *would speak so*.

2. My friends, the authors here quoted are well known, in whom you may read the words with your own eyes. And you who have read them know in your own consciences, they were spoken *in this sense*, and no other ; nay, that *this sense* of them is professedly defended, throughout the whole treatises from whence they are taken.

3. But be this as it may, do you indeed say, *No true Predestinarian ever did or would speak so* ? Why *every* true Predestinarian must speak so, and so must yourself too, if you dare *speak out*, unless they and you renounce your fundamental principle.

4. Your fundamental principle is this, *God from eternity ordained whatsoever should come to pass*. But from this single position undeniably follows every assertion hereafter mentioned. It remains therefore only that you choose which you please, (for one you must choose,) of these three things, either 1. To equivocate, evade the question, and to prevaricate without end : or, 2. To swallow all these assertions together, and honestly to avow them : or, 3. To renounce them altogether, and believe in Christ, *the Saviour of all*.

DIALOGUE, &c.

Friend. SIR, I have heard that you make God the author of all sin, and the destroyer of the greater part of mankind without mercy.

Pred. I deny it ; I only say, * “God did from all eternity unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass.”

* Assembly's Catechism, Chap. 3.

Friend. Do you make no exception ?

Pred. No surely ; For * “ Nothing is more absurd than to think any thing at all is done but by the ordination of God.”

Friend. Do you extend this to the actions of men ?

Pred. Without doubt : † “ Every action and motion of every creature is so governed by the hidden counsel of God, that nothing can come to pass, but what was ordained by him.”

Friend. But what then becomes of the wills of men ?

Pred. ‡ “ The wills of men are so governed by the will of God, that they are carried on straight to the mark which he has fore-ordained.”

Friend. I suppose you mean the *permissive* will of God ?

Pred. No, I mean, || “ All things come to pass, by the *efficacious* and *irresistible* will of God.”

Friend. Why then all men *must* do just what they do.

Pred. True, § “ It is impossible that any thing should ever be done, but that to which God impels the will of man.”

Friend. But does not this imply the necessity of all events ?

Pred. ¶ “ I will not scruple to own that the will of God lays a necessity on all things, and that every thing that he wills, necessarily comes to pass.”

Friend. Does sin then necessarily come to pass ?

Pred. Undoubtedly. For ** “ The almighty power of God extends itself to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men.”

Friend. I grant God foresaw the first man would fall.

Pred. Nay, †† “ God not only foresaw that Adam would fall, but also ordained that he should.”

Friend. I know God permitted Adam’s fall.

Pred. I tell you, ‡‡ “ He fell not only by the permission, but also by the appointment of God. |||| He sinned because God so ordained, because the Lord saw good.”

Friend. But do not those who differ from you, raise many objections against you as to this point ?

Pred. Yes. §§ “ Those poisonous dogs vomit out many things against God. ¶¶ They deny that the Scripture says, God decreed Adam’s fall. They say, He might have chose either to fall or not, and that God fore-ordained only to treat him according to his desert. As if God created the noblest of all his creatures, without fore-ordinating what should become of him !”

Friend. Did God then make Adam on purpose that he might fall ?

Pred. Undoubtedly. *** “ God made Adam and Eve to this very purpose that they might be tempted and led into sin. And by force of his decree, it could not otherwise be but they must sin.”

* Calvin’s Institutes, Book I. Chap. 16, sect. 8.. † Ibid. sect. 3. ‡ Ibid. sect. 8. || Dr. Twiss, Vindiciae Gratiae Protestatis et Providentiae Dei. Editio Jenso-niana, Pars III. p. 19. § Dr. Twiss, Vindiciae. Pars III. p. 19. I Calvin’s Inst. b. 3. c. 24. sect. 8. ** Assembly’s Catechism, c. 5. †† Calvin’s Inst. b. 3. c. 23. sect. 7. ¶¶ Calvin Responsio ad Calumnias Nebulonis ejusdam ad Articulum primum. |||| Calv. Inst. b. 3. c. 24. sect. 8. §§ Ibid. b. 3. c. 23. sect. 2. ¶¶ Ibid. sect. 7. *** Piscator Disput. Prædest. præf. p. 6.

Friend. But do not you ground God's decree on God's fore-knowledge rather than his will?

Pred. No. * "God foresees nothing but what he has decreed, and his decree precedes his knowledge."

Friend. Well, this may be truly termed *A horrible decree.*

Pred. † "I confess it is a horrible decree: yet no one can deny, but God foreknew Adam's fall, and therefore knew it, because he had ordained it so by his own decree."

Friend. Do you believe then that God has by his own positive decree, not only *elected* some men to life, but also *reprobated* all the rest?

Pred. Most surely, if I believe one I believe the other. ‡ "Many indeed (thinking to excuse God) own election, and yet deny reprobation: but this is quite silly and childish. For without reprobation, election itself cannot stand; whom God passes by, those he reprobates."

Friend. Pray explain what you mean by election and reprobation.

Pred. With all my heart. § "All men are not created for the same end; but some are fore-ordained to eternal life; others to eternal damnation. So according as every man was created for the one end or the other, we say he was *elected* or *predestinated* to life, or *reprobated*, i. e. *predestinated* to destruction."

Friend. Pray repeat your meaning.

Pred. || "God hath once for all appointed by an eternal and unchangeable decree, to whom he would give salvation, and whom he would devote to destruction."

Friend. Did God make any man on purpose that he might be damned?

Pred. Did I not tell you before? ¶ "God's first constitution was, that some should be destined to eternal ruin; and to this end their sins were ordained, and denial of grace in order to their sins."

Friend. But is not God's predestinating men to life or death grounded on his fore-knowledge?

Pred. ** "So the vulgar think; that God as he foresees every man will deserve, elects them to life, or devotes them to death and damnation."

Friend. And do not you think that reprobation, at least, is grounded on God's fore-knowing men's sins?

Pred. No indeed. †† "God of his own good pleasure ordains that many should be born, who are from the womb devoted to inevitable damnation. If any man pretend that God's fore-knowledge lays them under no necessity of being damned, but rather that he decreed their damnation, because he foreknew their wickedness; I grant that God's fore-knowledge alone lays no necessity on the creature; but eternal life and death depend on the will rather than the foreknowledge of God. If God only fore-knew all things that relate to all

* Piscat. Disput. Prædest. † Calv. Inst. b. 3. c. 23. sect. 7. ‡ Ibid. sect. 1.

§ Ibid. c. 21. sect. 1. || Ibid. sect. 7. ¶ Zanchius de Natura Dei. p. 553, 554.

** Calvin Inst. b. 3. c. 22. sect. 1. †† Ibid. c. 2 3, sect. 6.

then, and did not decree and ordain them also, then it might be inquired whether or not his fore-knowledge necessitates the thing fore-known. But seeing he therefore fore-knows all things that will come to pass, because he has decreed they shall come to pass, it is vain to contend about fore-knowledge, since it is plain all things come to pass by God's positive decree."

Friend. But if God has positively decreed to damn the greater part of mankind, why does he call upon them to repent and be saved?

Pred. * "As God has his effectual call, whereby he gives the elect the salvation to which he ordained them; so he has his judgments towards the reprobates, whereby he executes his decree concerning them. As many, therefore, as he created to live miserably, and then perish everlasting; these, that they may be brought to the end for which they were created, he sometimes deprives of the possibility of hearing the word, and at other times, by the preaching thereof, blinds and stupifies them the more."

Friend. How is this? I say, if God has created them for never ending death, why does he call to them to turn and live?

Pred. † "He calls to them, that they may be more deaf; he kindles a light, that they may be the more blind: he brings his doctrine to them, that they may be more ignorant; and applies the remedy to them, that they may not be healed."

Friend. Enough, enough. Yet you do not make God the author of sin?

Pred. No, certainly. ‡ "God cannot be termed the author of sin though he is the cause of those actions which are sins."

Friend. How is he the cause of them then?

Pred. Two ways; first, by his eternal, unchangeable decree: secondly, by his present, irresistible power.

Friend. Did God then fore-ordain the sins of any man?

Pred. § "Both the reprobates and the elect were fore-ordained to Sin, as Sin, that the glory of God might be declared thereby. || The reprobates, *more especially*, who were predestinated to damnation, and the causes of damnation, and created to that end that they might live wickedly, and be vessels full of the dregs of sin."

Friend. But surely the sins of the elect were not fore-ordained?

Pred. Yes, but they were. ¶ "For we neither can do more good than we do, nor less evil than we do; because God from eternity has precisely decreed that both the good and the evil should be so done."

Friend. I understand you, as to God's decreeing sin. But how is his irresistible power *now* concerned in the sins of men?

Pred. * "God is the author of that action, which is sinful, by his irresistible will!"

Friend. How do you mean?

* Calvin Inst. b. 3. c. 24. sect. 12. † Ibid. c. 24. sect. 13. ‡ Petri Martyris Vermil. Com. in Roman. p. 413. § Zachius de Nat. Dei. p. 555. || Piscator contra Tauffum. p. 47. ¶ Piscatoris Responsio ad amicam duplicationem Conradi Vorstii, p. 176.

** Dr. Twiss. pars III. p. 21.

Pred. * “God procures adultery, cursings, lyings. † He supplies wicked men with opportunities of sinning, and inclines their hearts thereto. He blinds, deceives, and seduces them. He by his working on their heart, bends and stirs them up to do evil. And thus. ‡ Thieves, murderers, and other malefactors are God’s instruments, which he uses to execute what he hath decreed in himself.”

Friend. Do you not then charge God himself with sin?

Pred. No. § “God necessitates them only to the act of sin, not to the deformity of sin. Besides. ¶ When God makes angels or men sin, he does not sin himself, because he does not break any law. For God is under no law, and therefore cannot sin.”

Friend. But how does God make angels or men sin?

Pred. ¶ “The Devil and wicked men are so held in on every side by the hand of God that they cannot conceive, or contrive, or execute any mischief, any farther than God himself doth not only permit, but command. Nor are they only held in fetters, but compelled also as with a bridle, to perform obedience to those commands.”

Friend. This is true Turkish doctrine, and ought so to be exploded as that used to be in these words:—“I do anathematize the blasphemy of Mahomed, which saith, that God deceiveth whom he will, and whom he will he leadeth to that which is good. Himself doth what he willeth, and is himself the cause of all good and evil. Fate and destiny govern all things.” *Nicetus Saracenita.*

Pred. Nay, our doctrine is more ancient than Mahomed. It was maintained by St. Augustine.

Friend. Augustine speaks sometimes for it, and sometimes against it. But all antiquity for the first four centuries is against you, as is the whole eastern church to this day; and the Church of England, both in her catechism, articles, and homilies. And so are divers of our most holy martyrs, Bishop Hooper and Bishop Latimer in particular.

Pred. But does not antiquity say, Judas was predestinated to damnation?

Friend. Quite the contrary. St. Chrysostom’s express words are: “Judas, my Beloved, was at first a child of the kingdom, and heard it said to him with the disciples, *Ye shall sit on twelve thrones.* But afterwards he became the child of hell.”

Pred. However, you will own Esau was predestinated to destruction.

Friend. Indeed I will not. Some of your own writers believe he was finally saved; which was the general opinion of the ancient fathers. And that scripture, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated.* plainly relates not to their persons, but their posterities. But supposing Esau or Judas to be damned, what is he damned for?

Pred. Without question for unbelief. For as we are saved by faith alone, so unbelief is the only damning sin.

* Piscat. Responsio ad Apologiam Bertii. † Pet. Martyr. Ver. Comment. in Rom. p. 36, 413. ‡ Calv. Inst. b. 1. c. 17. sect. 5. § Twiss Vindicæ, pars III. p. 22. ¶ Zuinglius i. Serm. de Provid. c. 5, 6. ¶ Cayl. Inst. b. 1. c. 17. sect. 11.

Friend. By what faith are you saved?

Pred. By faith in Christ, who gave himself for me.

Friend. But did he give himself for Esau and Judas? If not, you say, they are damned for not believing a lie. This consideration it was which forced Archbishop Usher to cry out, "What would not a man flee unto, rather than yield, that Christ did not die for the reprobates; and that none but the elect had any kind of title to him: and yet many thousands should be bound in conscience to believe that he died for them, and tied to accept him for their Redeemer and Saviour? Whereby they should have believed that which in itself is most untrue, and laid hold of that in which they had no kind of interest."

Pred. But what then do you mean by the words *Election* and *Reprobation*?

Friend. I mean this. 1st. God did decree from the beginning to elect or choose (in Christ) all that should believe to salvation. And this decree proceeds from his own goodness, and is not built upon any goodness in the creature. 2dly. God did from the beginning decree, to reprobate all, who should obstinately and finally continue in unbelief.

Pred. What then do you think of *absolute unconditional election* and *reprobation*?

Friend. I think it cannot be found in holy Writ, and that it is a plant which bears dismal fruit. An instance of which we have in Calvin himself; who confesses that he procured the burning to death of Michael Servetus, a wise and holy man, purely for differing from him in opinion, in matters of religion.

THE CONSEQUENCE PROVED.

1. Mr. Toplady, a young, bold man, lately published a pamphlet, an extract from which was soon after printed, concluding with these words:

"The sum of all is this: one in twenty (suppose) of mankind are *elected*; nineteen in twenty are *reprobated*. The *elect* shall be saved, do what they will: the *reprobate* shall be damned, do what they can."

2. A great outcry has been raised on that account, as though this was not a fair state of the case: and it has been vehemently affirmed, that no such consequence follows from the doctrine of absolute predestination.

I calmly affirm, It is a fair state of the case; this consequence does naturally and necessarily follow from the doctrine of absolute

predestination, as here stated and defended by bold Mr. Augustus Toplady.

Indeed, I have not leisure to consider the matter at large. I can only make a few strictures, and leave the young man to be farther corrected by (one that is full his match) Mr. Thomas Oliver's.

3. "When love is predicated of God, it implies, 1. His everlasting will, purpose, and determination to save his people." (Mr. T's Tract, chap. 1.) I appeal to all men, whether it is not a natural consequence even of this, that "all these shall be saved, do what they will."

You may say, "O, but they will do only what is good." Be it so. Yet the consequence stands.

"*Election* signifies that *sovereign, unconditional, immutable* act of God, whereby he *selected* some to be eternally saved." *Immutable, unconditional!* From hence then it undeniably follows, "These shall be saved, do what they will."

"Predestination, as relating to the elect, is that irreversible act of the divine will, whereby God determined to deliver *a certain number* of men from hell." *Ergo*, That *certain number* shall infallibly be saved, do what they will. Who can deny the consequence?

"Not one of the elect can perish, but they must all necessarily be saved." (chap. 3.) Can any assert this, and yet deny that consequence, therefore all the elect shall be saved, do what they will? Unless you would say, it is the proposition itself, rather than a consequence from it.

4. So much for the former part of the question: let us now consider the latter.

"Hatred, ascribed to God, implies a resolution *not* to have mercy on *such and such* men. So Esau *have I hated*; that is, I did from all eternity determine, *not* to have mercy on him." (chap. 1.) In other words:

I by my dire decree did seal
His fix'd, unalterable doom;
Consign'd his unborn soul to hell,
And damn'd him from his mother's womb.

Well then, does it not follow, by unavoidable consequence, that *such and such* men, poor, hated Esau in particular, "shall be damned. do what they can?"

"Reprobation denotes God's eternal preterition of some men, and his predestination of them to destruction." And is it possible for them, by any thing they can do, to prevent that destruction? You say, no. It follows, they "shall be damned, do what they can."

"Predestination, as it regards the reprobate, is that immutable act of God's will, whereby he hath determined to *leave some men to perish*." And can they avoid it by any thing they do? You affirm, they cannot. Again, therefore it follows, these "shall be damned. do what they can."

"We assert, there is a predestination of *particular persons* to death

which death they shall inevitably undergo." That is, "They shall be damned, do what they can."

"The *non-elect* were predestinated to eternal death." (chap. 2.) *Ergo*, "They shall be damned, do what they can."

"The condemnation of the reprobate is necessary and inevitable." Surely I need add no more on this head. You see, that "the reprobate shall be damned, do what they can," is the whole burden of the song.

5 Take only two precious sentences more, which include the whole question.

"We assert, that the number of the *elect*, (chap. 4,) and also of the *reprobate*, is so *fixed* and *determinate*, that neither can be *augmented* nor *diminished*: and

"That the decrees of election and reprobation are *immutable* and *irreversible*."

From each of these assertions, the whole consequence follows, clear as the noon-day sun. Therefore, "The elect shall be saved, do what they will: the reprobate shall be damned, do what they can."

6. I add a word, with regard to another branch of this kind, charitable doctrine.

Mr. Toplady says, "God has a positive will to destroy the reprobate for their sins." (chap. 1.) *For their sins!* How can that be? I positively assert, That (on this scheme) they have no sins at all. They never had: they can have none. For it cannot be a sin in a spark to rise, or in a stone to fall. And the spark or the stone is not more necessarily determined either to rise or to fall, than the man is to sin, to commit that rape, or adultery, or murder. For "God did, before all time, determine and direct to some particular end, every person or thing, to which he has given, or is yet to give being." God himself did "predestinate them to fill up the measure of their iniquities:" such was his sovereign, irresistible decree, before the foundation of the world. *To fill up the measure of their iniquities*, that is, to commit every act which they committed. So "God decreed the Jews to be the crucifiers of Christ, and Judas to betray him." (chap. 4.) Whose fault was it then? You plainly say, it was not *his* fault, but God's. For what was Judas, or ten thousand reprobates besides? Could they resist his decree? No more than they could pull the sun out of the firmament of heaven. And would God punish them with everlasting destruction, for not pulling the sun out of the firmament? He might as well do it for this, as for their not doing what (on this supposition) was equally impossible. "But they are punished for their impenitency, sin, and unbelief." Say unbelief and impenitency; but not sin. For "God had predestinated them to continue in impenitency and unbelief. God had positively ordained them to continue in their blindness and hardness of heart." Therefore their not repenting and believing was no more a sin, than their not pulling the sun from heaven.

7. Indeed Mr. T. himself owns, "The sins of the reprobate were not the cause of their being *passed by*; but merely and entirely the sovereign will and determining pleasure of God."

"O, but their sin was the cause of their *damnation*, though not of their *preterition*;" that is, God determined they should live and die in their sins, that he might afterwards damn them!

Was ever any thing like this? Yes, I have read something like it. When Tiberius had determined to destroy Sejanus and all his family, as it was unlawful to put a virgin to death, what could be done with his daughter, a child of nine years old? Why, the hangman was ordered first to *deflower*, and then to *strangle* her! Yet even good Tiberius did not order her to be strangled, "Because she had been deflowered!" If so, it had been a parallel case: it had been just what is here affirmed of the Most High.

8. One word more. "I will obviate," says Mr. T "a fallacious objection, How is *reprobation* reconcileable with the doctrine of a future judgment? There needs no pains to reconcile these two." No pains! Indeed there does: more pains than all the men upon earth, or all the devils in hell will ever be able to take. But go on. "In the last day, Christ will pass sentence on the non-elect. 1. Not for having done what they could not help, but, 2. For their *wilful ignorance* of divine things; 3. For their *obstinate unbelief*; 4. For their *omissions of moral duty*; and, 5. For their *repeated iniquities and transgressions*."

He will condemn them, 1. "Not for having done what they could not help." I say, yes; for having sinned against God to their lives' end. But this they could not help. He had himself decreed it. He had determined, they should continue impenitent. 2. "For their *wilful ignorance* of divine things." No. Their ignorance of God, and the things of God, was not wilful, was not originally owing to their own will, but to the sovereign will of God. *His* will, not theirs, was the *primary cause* of their continuing in that ignorance. 3. "For their *obstinate unbelief*." No: how can it be termed obstinate, when they never had a possibility of removing it? When God had absolutely decreed, before they were born, that they should live and die therein? 4. "For their *omissions of moral duty*:" that is, for not loving God and their neighbour, which is the sum of the moral law. Was it then ever in their power to love God and their neighbour? No: no more than to touch heaven with their hand. Had not God himself unalterably decreed, that they should not love either God or man? If, therefore, they are condemned for this, they are condemned for what they never could help. 5. "For their *repeated iniquities and transgressions*." And was it ever in their power to help these? Were they not predestinated thereto before the foundation of the world? How then can the judge of all the earth consign them to everlasting fire, for what was, in effect, his own act and deed?

I apprehend then this is no fallacious objection: but a solid and weighty one; and defy any man living, who asserts the unconditional decree of reprobation or preterition (just the same in effect) to "re-

concile this with the scriptural doctrine of a future judgment. I say, again, I defy any man on earth to show, how, on this scheme, God can judge the world in righteousness..

SERIOUS THOUGHTS UPON THE PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS.

1. MANY large volumes have been already published on this important subject. But the very length of them makes them hard to be understood, or even purchased, by common readers. A short, plain treatise on this head, is what serious men have long desired, and what is here offered to those whom God has endowed with love and meekness of wisdom.

2. By the SAINTS, I understand, Those who are holy or righteous, in the judgment of God himself: those who are endued with the faith that purifies the heart, that produces a good conscience: those who are grafted into the good Olive-tree, the spiritual, invisible church: those who are branches of the true Vine, of whom Christ says, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches:" those who so effectually know Christ, as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world; those who see the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, of the witness and fruits of the Spirit: those who live by faith in the Son of God; those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant: those to whom all, or any of these characters belong, I mean by the term SAINTS.

3. Can any of these fall away? By *falling away*, we mean, not barely falling into sin. This, it is granted, they may. But can they fall *totally*? Can any of these so fall from God, as to perish everlastinglly?

4. I am sensible, either side of this question is attended with great difficulties: such as reason alone could never remove. Therefore to the law and to the testimony. Let the living oracles decide: and if these speak for us, we neither seek nor want farther witness.

5. On this authority, I believe a SAINT may fall away; that one who is holy or righteous in the judgment of God himself, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlastinglly.

1. For thus saith the Lord, "When the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity,—in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in then shall he die." Ezek. xviii. 24.

That this is to be understood of eternal death, appears from the 26th verse : “ When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, [here is temporal death] for his iniquity that he hath done, he shall die : ” here is death eternal.

It appears farther, from the whole scope of the chapter, which is to prove, “ The soul that sinneth, it shall die,” ver. 4. If you say, “ The soul here means the body : ” I answer, that will die whether you sin or not.

6. Again, thus saith the Lord, “ When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live : if he trust to his own righteousness,” [yea, or to that promise as absolute and unconditional] “ and committeth iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for the iniquity that he hath committed shall he die.” chap. xxxiii. 13.

Again, “ When the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby,” ver. 18. Therefore, one who is holy and righteous in the judgment of God himself, may yet so fall as to perish everlasting.

7. But how is this consistent with what God declared elsewhere, “ If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments,—I will visit their offences with the rod, and their sin with scourges. Nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my truth to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips ; I have sworn once by my holiness, that I will not fail David.” Psalm lxxxix. 31—34.

I answer, there is no manner of inconsistency between the one declaration and the other. The prophet declares the just judgment of God, against every righteous man who falls from his righteousness. The Psalmist declares, “ The old loving kindnesses which God sware unto David in his truth. I have found,” saith he, “ David my servant ; with my holy oil have I anointed him. My hand shall hold him fast, and my arm shall strengthen him.—His seed also will I make to endure for ever; and his throne as the days of heaven. But if his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments.—Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my truth to fail. My covenant will I not break. I will not fail David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me,” ver. 21, 22, 30, 31.

May not every man see, That the covenant here spoken of, relate wholly to David and his seed, or children ? Where then is the inconsistency between the most absolute promise made to a particular family, and that solemn account which God has here given of his way of dealing with mankind ?

Besides the very covenant mentioned in these words is not absolute but conditional. The condition of repentance, in case of forsaking God’s law, was implied, though not expressed. And so strongly implied, that this condition failing, not being performed, God did also fail David. He did alter the thing that had gone out of his lips, and yet without any impeachment of his truth. He “ abhorred and

forsook his anointed, the seed of David, whose throne [if they had repented] should have been as the days of heaven," ver. 37. He did "break the covenant of his servant, and cast his crown to the ground," ver. 38. So vainly are these words of the Psalmist brought to contradict the plain, full testimony of the prophet.

8. Nor is there any contradiction between this testimony of God by Ezekiel, and those words which he spake by Jeremiah: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee." For, do these words assert, That no righteous man ever turns from his righteousness? No such thing. They do not touch the question, but simply declare God's love to the Jewish church. To see this in the clearest light, you need only read over the whole sentence. "At the same time, saith the Lord, I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people." "Thus saith the Lord, the people which were left of the sword, found grace in the wilderness, even Israel, when I caused him to rest." "The Lord hath appeared of old unto me," saith the prophet, speaking in the person of Israel, saying, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee. Again, I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel." ch. xxxi. ver. 1—4.

Suffer me here to observe once for all, a fallacy which is constantly used, by almost all writers on this point. They perpetually beg the question by applying to particular persons, assertions, or prophecies, which relate only to the church in general, and some of them only to the Jewish church and nation, as distinguished from all other people.

If you say, "But it was particularly revealed to *me*, that God had loved *me* with an everlasting love:" I answer, suppose it was, (which might bear a dispute,) it proves no more, at the most, than that *you* in particular shall persevere: but does not affect the general question, whether others shall, or shall not?

9. Secondly, one who is endued with the faith that purifies the heart, that produces a good conscience, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlasting.

For thus saith the inspired apostle, "War a good warfare, holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck." 1 Tim. i. 18, 19.

Observe, 1. These men (such as Hymeneus and Alexander) had once the faith that purifies the heart, that produces a good conscience: this they once had, or they could not have put it away.

Observe, 2. They made shipwreck of the faith, which necessarily implies the total and final loss of it. For a vessel once wrecked can never be recovered. It is totally and finally lost.

And the Apostle himself, in his second epistle to Timothy, mentions one of these two as irrecoverably lost. "Alexander, says he, did me much evil: The Lord shall reward him according to his works." 2 Tim. iv. 14.

Therefore, one who is endued with the faith that purifies the heart,

that produces a good conscience, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlasting.

10. But how can this be reconciled with the words of our Lord, “He that believeth shall be saved?”

Do you think these words mean, *He that believeth* at this moment, *shall* certainly and inevitably *be saved*? If this interpretation be good, then by all the rules of speech, the other part of the sentence must mean, *He that does not believe* at this moment *shall* certainly and inevitably *be damned*. Therefore that interpretation cannot be good. The plain meaning then of the whole sentence is, *He that believeth*, if he continue in faith, *shall be saved*; *he that believeth not*, if he continue in unbelief, *shall be damned*.

11. “But does not Christ say elsewhere, ‘He that believeth, hath everlasting life?’ John iii. 36. And ‘He that believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life?’” ch. v. ver. 24.

I answer, 1. The love of God is everlasting life. It is in substance the life of heaven. Now every one that believes, loves God; and therefore hath everlasting life. 2. Every one that believes is therefore passed from death, spiritual death, unto life; and, 3. Shall not come into condemnation, if he endureth in the faith unto the end: according to our Lord’s own words, “He that endureth to the end, shall be saved;” and, “Verily I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.” John viii. 51.

12. Thirdly, Those who are grafted into the good olive-tree, the spiritual, invisible church, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlasting. For thus saith the apostle, “Some of the branches are broken off, and thou art grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree. Be not high-minded, but fear: if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee. Behold the goodness and severity of God! on them which fell severity; but toward thee goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou shalt be cut off.” Rom. xi. 20—22. We may observe here, 1. The persons spoken to, were actually grafted into the olive-tree.

2. This olive-tree is not barely the outward, visible church; but the invisible, consisting of holy believers. So the text: “If the first fruits be holy, the lump is holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.”

3. These holy believers were still liable to be cut off from the invisible church, into which they were then grafted:

4. Here is not the least intimation of those who were so cut off, being ever grafted in again. Therefore, those who are grafted into the good Olive-tree, the spiritual, invisible church, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlasting.

13. “But how does this agree with the 29th verse, ‘The gifts and calling of God are without repentance?’”

The preceding verse shows: “As touching the election,” (the un-

conditional election of the Jewish nation,) "they are beloved for the father's sake;" for the sake of their forefathers. It follows, (in proof of this, that "they are beloved for the father's sake,") that God has still blessings in store for the Jewish nation, "For the gifts and callings of God are without repentance :" for God doth not repent of any blessings he hath given them, or any privileges he hath called them to. The words here referred to, were originally spoken with a peculiar regard to these national blessings. "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent." Numb. xxiii. 19.

14. "But do not you hereby make God changeable ?" Whereas "with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning ?" By no means. God is unchangeably holy. Therefore he always loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. He is unchangeably good. Therefore he pardoneth all that "repent and believe the gospel." And he is unchangeably just ; therefore he "rewardeth every man according to his works." But all this hinders not his resisting, when they are proud, those to whom he gave grace when they were humble. Nay, his unchangeableness itself requires, that if they grow high-minded, God should cut them off : that there should be a proportionable change, in all the divine dispensations toward them.

15. "But how then is God faithful ?" I answer, in fulfilling every promise which he hath made, to all to whom it is made, all who fulfil the condition of that promise. More particularly, 1st. "God is faithful, in that he will not suffer you to be tempted above that you are able to bear." 1 Cor. x. 13. 2d. "The Lord is faithful, to establish and keep you from evil," 2 Thess. iii. 2. (if you put your trust in him,) from all the evil which you might otherwise suffer, through "unreasonable and wicked men." 3. "Quench not the Spirit ; hold fast that which is good ; abstain from all appearance of evil :" and your "whole spirit, soul, and body, shall be preserved blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he who calleth you, who also will do it." 1 Thess. v. 19, &c. 4. Be not disobedient unto the heavenly calling ; and "God is faithful by whom ye were called, to confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless, in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. i. 8, 9. Yet, notwithstanding all this, unless you fulfil the condition, you cannot attain the promise.

"Nay, but are not 'all the promises yea and amen ?'" They are. They are firm as the pillars of heaven. Perform the condition : and the promise is sure. "Believe and thou shalt be saved."

"But many promises are absolute and unconditional." In many, the condition is not expressed. But this does not prove there is none implied. No promises can be expressed, in a more absolute form, than those above cited, from the 89th Psalm. And yet we have seen, a condition was implied even there, though none was expressed.

16. "But there is no condition either expressed or implied, in those words of St. Paul, 'I am persuaded that neither death, nor

life, nor height, nor depth, nor any creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Rom. viii. 38, 39.

Suppose there is not, (which will bear a dispute,) yet what will this prove? Just thus much, that the apostle was at that time fully persuaded of his own perseverance. And I doubt not, but many believers at this day, have the very same persuasion, termed in Scripture, the "full assurance of hope." But this does not prove, that every believer shall persevere: any more than that every believer is thus fully persuaded of his perseverance.

IV 17. Fourthly, those who are branches of the true Vine, of whom Christ says, "I am the Vine, ye are the branches," may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlastingily.

For thus saith our blessed Lord himself, "I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away." "I am the Vine, ye are the branches. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

Here we may observe, 1. The persons spoken of, were *in Christ, branches of the true Vine.*

2. Some of these *branches abide not in Christ, but the Father taketh them away;*

3. The *branches* which *abide not*, are *cast forth*, cast out from Christ and his Church:

4. They are not only *cast forth* but *withered*; consequently never grafted in again. Nay,

5. They are not only *cast forth* and *withered*, but also *cast into the fire*. And,

6. They *are burned*. It is not possible for words more strongly to declare, that even those who are now branches in the true Vine, may yet so fall, as to perish everlastingily.

18. By this clear, indisputable declaration of our Lord, we may interpret those that might be otherwise liable to dispute: wherein it is certain, whatever he meant beside, he did not mean to contradict himself. For example, "This is the Father's will, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing." Most sure; all that God hath given him, or, (as it is expressed in the next verse,) "every one who believeth on him," viz. to the end, he "will raise up at the last day," to reign with him for ever.

Again, "I am the living bread,—If any man eat of this bread (by faith) he shall live for ever," ver. 51. True; if he continue to eat thereof. And who can doubt of it?

Again, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." John x. 27—29.

In the preceding text, the condition is only implied. In this it is plainly expressed. *They are my sheep, that hear my voice, that follow*

in all holiness. And “if ye do these things, ye shall never fall.” None shall “pluck you out of my hands.”

Again, “Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end.” John xiii. 1. *Having loved his own*, namely the apostles, (as the very next words, *which were in the world*, evidently show, *he loved them unto the end* of his life, and manifested that love to the last.

19. Once more, “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are one.” ch. xvii. 11.

Great stress has been laid upon this text: and it has been hence inferred, that *all those whom the Father had given him* (a phrase frequently occurring in this chapter) must infallibly persevere to the end.

And yet in the very next verse, our Lord himself declares, that *one of those whom the Father had given him*, did not persevere unto the end, but perished everlasting. His own words are, “Those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition,” ver. 12. So one even of these was finally lost, a demonstration that the phrase *Those whom thou hast given me*, signifies here, (if not in most other places too,) the twelve apostles and them only.

20. On this occasion, I cannot but observe another common instance of begging the question, of taking for granted what ought to be proved: it is usually laid down, as an undisputable truth, that whatever our Lord speaks to, or of, his apostles, is to be applied to all believers. But this cannot be allowed by any who impartially search the Scriptures. They cannot allow without clear and particular proof, that any of those texts which related primarily to the apostles (as all men grant) belong to any but them.

V. 21. Fifthly, those who so effectually know Christ, as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world, may yet fall back into those pollutions, and perish everlasting.

For thus saith the apostle Peter, “If after they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, [the only possible way of escaping them,] they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.” 2 Pet. ii. 20, 21. “For it had been better for them, not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.”

That the “knowledge of the way of righteousness,” which they had attained, was an inward, experimental knowledge, is evident from that other expression, “They had escaped the pollutions of the world:” an expression parallel to that in the preceding chapter, “Having escaped the corruption which is in the world,” ver. 4. And in both chapters, this effect is ascribed to the same cause: termed in the first, “The knowledge of him who hath called us, to glory and virtue:” in the second, more explicitly, “The knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

And yet they lost that experimental knowledge of Christ, and the way of righteousness : they fell back into the same pollutions they had escaped ; and were again “ entangled therein and overcome.” “ They turned from the holy commandment delivered unto them,” so that their “ latter end was worse than their beginning.”

Therefore, those who effectually know Christ, as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world, may yet fall back into those pollutions and perish everlastingily.

22. And this is perfectly consistent with St. Peter’s words, in the first chapter of his former epistle : “ Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.” Undoubtedly so are all they who ever attain eternal salvation. It is the power of God only, and not our own, by which we are kept one day, or one hour.

VI. 23. Sixthly, Those who “ see the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ,” and who have been “ made partakers of the Holy Ghost,” of the witness and the fruits of the Spirit ; may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlastingily. For thus saith the inspired writer to the Hebrews, “ It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost,—If they fall away, to renew them again to repentance ; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame,” ch. vi. 4. 6.

Must not every unprejudiced person see, the expressions here used are so strong and clear, that they cannot, without gross and palpable wresting, be understood of any but true believers ?

They *were once enlightened* : an expression familiar with the apostle, and never by him applied to any but believers. So “ The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation.—The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling—And what is the exceeding greatness of his power, toward us that believe.” Eph. i. 17—19. So again, “ God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” 2 Cor. iv. 6. This is a light which no unbelievers have. They are utter strangers to such enlightening. “ The god of this world hath blinded the minds of them who believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them,” ver. 4.

They had tasted of the heavenly gift, (emphatically so called) *and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost*. So St. Peter likewise couples them together : “ Be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,” (Acts ii. 38,) whereby the love of God was shed abroad in their hearts, with all the other fruits of the Spirit. Yea, it is remarkable that our Lord himself, in his grand commission to St. Paul, (to which the apostle probably alludes in these words, comprises all these three particulars. Acts xxvi. 18, “ I send thee to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, [here contracted into

that one expression, “ They were enlightened”] “ that they may receive forgiveness of sins, (the heavenly gift,) and an inheritance among them who are sanctified ;” who are made *partakers of the Holy Ghost*, of all the sanctifying influences of the Spirit.

The expression, “ They *tasted* of the heavenly gift,” is taken from the Psalmist, “ Taste and see that the Lord is good.” Psalm xxxiv. 8. As if he had said, be ye as assured of his love, as of any thing you see with your eyes. And let the assurance thereof be sweet to your soul, as honey is to your tongue.

And yet those who had been thus *enlightened*, had *tasted this gift*, and been thus *partakers of the Holy Ghost*, so *fell away*, that it was *impossible to renew them again* to repentance.

“ But the apostle only makes a supposition, *If they shall fall away.*”

I answer, The apostle makes no supposition at all. There is no *if* in the original. The words are, Ἀδύνατον τοις απαξ φαίσθεντας—καὶ παραπέσοντας. That is, in plain English, *It is impossible to renew again unto repentance, those who were once enlightened and have fallen away:* therefore they must perish everlasting.

24. “ But if so, then farewell all my comfort.”

Then your comfort depends upon a poor foundation. My comfort stands not on any opinion, either that a believer can, or cannot fall away, not on the remembrance of any thing wrought in me *yesterday*; but on what is *to-day*: on my *present* knowledge of God in Christ, reconciling me to himself. On my *now* beholding the light of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ; walking in the light, as he is in the light, and having fellowship with the Father and with the Son. My comfort is that, through grace, I now believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; and that his Spirit *doth* bear witness with my spirit, that I am a child of God. I take comfort in this and this only, that I see Jesus at the right hand of God: that I personally, for myself, and not for another, have a hope full of immortality; that I feel the love of God shed abroad in my heart, being crucified to the world, and the world crucified to me. My rejoicing is this, the testimony of my conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, I have my conversation in the world.

Go and find, if you can, a more solid joy, a more blissful comfort, on this side heaven. But this comfort is not shaken, be that opinion true or false; whether the saints in general can or cannot fall. If you take up with any comfort short of this, you lean on the staff of a broken reed, which not only will not bear your weight, but will enter your hand and pierce you.

VII. 25. Seventhly, Those who live by faith, may yet fall from God and perish everlasting.

For thus saith the same inspired writer, “ The just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.” Heb. x. 38. *The just, the justified person, shall live by faith, even now shall he live the life which is hid with Christ in God: and if he endure unto the end, he shall live with God for ever. But if*

any man draw back, saith the Lord, my soul shall have no pleasure in him: that is, I will utterly cast him off; and accordingly the drawing back here spoken of, is termed in the verse immediately following, *drawing back to perdition*.

“But the person supposed to draw back is not the same with him who is said to live by faith.”

I answer, 1. Who is it then? Can any man draw back from faith who never came to it? But,

2. Had the text been fairly translated, there had been no pretence for this objection. For the original runs thus: *ο δικαιος εν πιστει οντος και εαν υπεστηντων*. If *ο δικαιος*, the *just man that lives by faith* [so the expression necessarily implies, *here being no other nominative to the verb*] *draws back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him*.

“But the apostle adds, ‘We are not of them who draw back unto perdition.’” And what will you infer from thence? This is so far from contradicting what has been observed before, that it manifestly confirms it. It is a farther proof, that there are those *who draw back unto perdition*, although the apostle was not of that number. Therefore those who live by faith, may yet fall from God and perish everlasting.

26. “But does not God say to every one that lives by faith, ‘I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee?’”

The whole sentence runs thus, “Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be content with such things as ye have; for he hath said, I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.” Heb. xiii. 5. True; provided “your conversation be without covetousness, and ye be content with such things as ye have.” Then you may *boldly say*, “The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.”

Do you not see, 1. That this promise, as here recited, relates wholly to temporal things? 2. That even thus taken, it is not absolute but conditional: and, 3. That the condition is expressly mentioned in the very same sentence?

VIII. 27. Eighthly, Those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant, may so fall from God as to perish everlasting.

For thus again saith the apostle, “If we sin wilfully, after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing.” Heb. x. 26—29.

It is undeniably plain, 1. That the person mentioned here, was once sanctified by the blood of the covenant. 2. That he afterwards, by known, wilful sin, trod under foot the Son of God: and, 3. That he hereby incurred a sorer punishment than death, namely, death everlasting.

Therefore, those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant, may yet so fall as to perish everlasting.

28. "What ! Can the blood of Christ burn in hell ? Or can the purchase of the blood of Christ go thither ?"

I answer, 1. The blood of Christ cannot burn in hell, no more than it can be spilt on the earth. The heavens must contain both his flesh and blood, until the restitution of all things. But,

2. If the oracles of God are true, one who was purchased by the blood of Christ may go thither. For he who was sanctified by the blood of Christ, was purchased by the blood of Christ. But one who was sanctified by the blood of Christ, may nevertheless go to hell ; may fall under that fiery indignation, which shall for ever devour the adversaries.

29. "Can a child of God then go to hell ? Or can a man be a child of God to-day, and a child of the Devil to-morrow ? If God is our Father once, is he not our Father always ?" I answer,

1. A child of God, that is, a true believer, (for *he* that believeth is born of God,) while he continues a true believer, cannot go to hell. But, 2. If a believer makes shipwreck of the faith, he is no longer a child of God. And then he may go to hell, yea, and certainly will, if he continues in unbelief. 3. If a believer may make shipwreck of the faith, then a man who believes now, may be an unbeliever some time hence; yea, very possibly, to-morrow : but if so, he who is a child of God to-day, may be a child of the Devil to-morrow. For, 4. God is the Father of them who believe, so long as they believe. But the Devil is the father of them that believe not, whether they did once believe or not.

30. The sum of all is this. If the Scriptures are true, those who are holy or righteous in the judgment of God himself : those who are endued with the faith that purifies the heart, that produces a good conscience : those who are grafted into the good Olive tree, the spiritual, invisible church : those who are branches of the true Vine, of whom Christ says, I am the Vine, ye are the branches : those who so effectually know Christ, as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world : those who see the light of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ, and who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, of the witness and of the fruits of the Spirit : those who live by faith in the Son of God : those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant; may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlasting.

*Therefore, "*Let him who standeth, take heed lest he fall.*"

THOUGHTS
ON THE
IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

1. A TRACT has lately been published in my name, concerning *The Imputed Righteousness of Christ*. This calls me to explain myself upon that head; which I will do with all the clearness I can. But I quarrel with no man for thinking or speaking otherwise than I do: I blame none for using those expressions which he believes to be scriptural. If he quarrels with me for not using them, at least, not so frequently as himself, I can only pity him, and wish him more of "the Mind which was in CHRIST."

2. *The Righteousness of Christ* is an expression which I do not find in the Bible. *The Righteousness of God* is an expression which I do find there. I believe this means, first, *The Mercy of God*, as 2 Pet. i. 1: "Them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God." How does it appear, that the righteousness of God here means either more or less than his mercy? Psalm lxxi. 15, &c. "My mouth shall show forth thy righteousness and thy salvation:" thy mercy in delivering me. "I will make mention of thy righteousness only." "Thy righteousness, O God, is very high." Here the righteousness of God is expressly mentioned. But I will not take upon me to say, that it means the righteousness or mercy of the Son, any more than of the Holy Ghost.

3. I believe this expression means, Secondly, God's method of justifying sinners. So Rom. i. 17: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for therein is the righteousness of God, (his way of justifying sinners,) revealed." Chap. iii. 21, &c. "Now the righteousness of God is manifested: even the righteousness of God which is by faith:" (unless righteousness here also means mercy.) "Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood; to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past: that he might be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Chap. x. 3. "They being ignorant of God's righteousness," his method of justifying sinners, "and going about to establish their own righteousness," a method of their own, opposite to his, "have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."

4. Perhaps it has a peculiar meaning in 2 Cor. v. 21: "He made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God, in or through him:" that we might be justi-

ined and sanctified, might receive the whole blessing of God through him.

5. And is not this the most natural meaning of Phil. iii. 8, 9 ? "That I may win Christ, and be found in him," grafted into the true Vine, "not having my own righteousness," the method of justification which I so long chose for myself, "which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God," the method of justification which God hath chosen, "*by faith*."

6. "But is not Christ termed, our Righteousness?" He is, Jer. xxiii. 6 : "This is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness." And is not the plain, indisputable meaning of this scripture, He shall *be* what he is *called*, the sole purchaser, the sole meritorious cause, both of our justification and sanctification ?

7. Nearly related to this is the following text : 1 Cor. i. 30, "Jesus Christ is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." And what does this prove, but that he is made unto us righteousness or justification, just as he is made unto us sanctification ? In what sense ? He is the sole author of the one, as well as of the other, the Author of our whole salvation.

8. There seems to be something more implied in Rom. x. 4; does it not imply thus much : "Christ is the end of the law," not only of the Mosaic dispensation, but of the law of works, which was given to Adam in his original perfection, "for righteousness" to every one that believeth :" to the end that every one who believeth in him, though he has not kept, and cannot keep that law, may be both accounted and made righteous ?

9. Accordingly, frequent mention is made in Scripture, of "faith counted for righteousness." So Gen. xv. 6 : "He (Abraham) believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness :" a text repeated, with but little variation, over and over in the New Testament. Rom. iv. 5 : "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Thus it was that "Noah became heir of the righteousness," the justification, "which is by faith." Heb. xi. 7. Thus also "the Gentiles," when the Jews fell short, "attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is by faith." Rom. ix. 30. But that expression, *The Righteousness of Christ*, does not occur in any of these texts.

10. It seems, righteousness, in the following texts, means neither more nor less than justification. Gal. ii. 21 ; "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Chap. iii. 21 ; "If

he not mean the righteousness of Christ?" Undoubtedly he does ; but this is not the question. We are not inquiring, what he *means*, but what he *says*. We are all agreed as to the *meaning*, but not as to the *expression*, The imputing the righteousness of Christ, which I still say, I dare not insist upon, neither require any one to use ; because I cannot find it in the Bible. If any one can, he has better eyes than I : and I wish he would show me where it is.

12. Now, if by the righteousness of Christ we mean any thing which the Scripture does not mean, it is certain we put darkness for light. If we mean the same which the Scripture means by different expressions, why do we prefer this expression to the scriptural? Is not this correcting the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, and opposing our own to the perfect knowledge of God?

13. I am myself the more sparing in the use of it ; because it has been so frequently and so dreadfully abused : and because the Antinomians use it at this day to justify the grossest abominations. And it is great pity those who love, who preach, and follow after holiness, should, under the notion of honouring Christ, give any countenance to those who continually make him the *Minister of sin*, and so build on his righteousness, as to live in such ungodliness and unrighteousness as is scarcely named even among the heathens.

14. And doth not this way of speaking naturally tend to make Christ the Minister of sin? For if the very personal obedience of Christ (as those expressions directly lead me to think,) be mine, the moment I believe, can any thing be added thereto? Does my obeying God add any value to the perfect obedience of Christ? On this scheme then, are not the holy and unholy on the very same footing?

15. Upon the whole, I cannot express my thoughts better, than in the words of that good man, Mr. Hervey : "If people may be safe, and their inheritance secure, without any knowledge of these particularities, why should you offer to puzzle their heads with a few unnecessary terms?"—"We are not very solicitous as to the credit, or the use, of any particular set of phrases. Only let men be humbled as repenting criminals, at the Redeemer's feet ; let them rely as devoted pensioners, on his precious merits : and they are undoubtedly in the way to a blissful immortality." Dialogues, Vol. I. p. 43 Dublin edition.

Dublin, April 5, 1762.

A

BLOW AT THE ROOT,

OR

CHRIST STABBED IN THE HOUSE OF HIS FRIENDS.

“Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a Kiss?”—LUKE xxii. 46.

1. “WITHOUT holiness no man shall see the **LORD**,” shall see the face of God in glory. Nothing under heaven can be more sure than this: “For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” And though heaven and earth pass away, yet his “word shall not pass away.” As well therefore might God fall from heaven, as this word fall to the ground. No, it cannot be: None shall live with God, but he that now *lives to God*: None shall enjoy the glory of God in heaven, but he that bears the image of God on earth. None that is not saved from sin here, can be saved from hell hereafter. None can see the kingdom of God above, unless the kingdom of God be in him below. Whosoever will reign with Christ in heaven, must have Christ reigning in him on earth. He must have “that mind in him which was in Christ,” enabling him “to walk as Christ also walked.”

2. And yet as sure as this is, and as clearly as it is taught in every part of the Holy Scripture, there is scarcely one among all the truths of God, which is less received with men. It was indeed acknowledged in some degree, even among the wiser heathens. Some among them allowed that nothing would please God but the *sancti recessus mentis, et incocutum generoso- pectus honesto*: “A virtuous, holy mind, and a heart deep dyed with generous honesty.” But though they could not deny, yet how easily and effectually did they evade this! They fancied something else would do as well: That some rites or ceremonies, some external forms, or glorious actions, would supply the place of inward holiness. So the famous Roman entitles to future happiness, not only the good and virtuous, but all

“*Ob patriam pugnando vulnera passos*

“*Quique pie Vates, et Phaebo digna locuti;*

“*Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes.*”

So, to fight for their country, to write good verses, or to invent useful arts, was abundantly sufficient, in the judgment of the wisest heathens, to give men a place in heaven!

3. But this would not pass with modern Romans. They despised such gross imaginations. But though they did not allow these, they

found out another way to get to heaven without holiness. In the room of them they substituted penances, pilgrimages, praying to saints and angels: and, above all these, masses for the dead, absolution by a priest, and extreme unction. And these satisfy the Romanists full as well as lustrations did the heathens. Thousands of them make no manner of doubt, but by a diligent use of these, without any holiness at all, they shall see the Lord in glory.

4. However, Protestants will not be satisfied thus: They know this hope is no better than a spider's web. They are convinced, that whoever leans on this, leans on the staff of a broken reed. What then can they do? How shall they hope to see God without holiness? Why, by doing no harm, doing good, going to the church and sacrament. And many thousands sit down content with this, believing they are in the high road to heaven.

5. Yet many cannot rest here. They look upon this as the very "Popery of Protestantism." They well know, that although none can be a real Christian, without carefully abstaining from all evil, using every means of grace, at every opportunity, and doing all possible good to all men: yet a man may go thus far, may do all this, and be but a heathen still. They know this religion is too superficial. It is but, as it were, skin deep. Therefore it is not Christianity; for that lies in the heart: it is, Worshipping God in spirit and in truth. It is no other than "the Kingdom of God within us;" it is "the Life of God" in the soul of man: it is "the mind which was in Christ Jesus;" it is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

6. Besides, they see that be this religion shallower or deeper, it does not stand on the right foundation: Since "other foundation" for true religion "can no man lay, than that which is laid, even Christ Jesus;" since no one can have the mind which was in Christ, till he is justified by his blood; till he is forgiven and reconciled to God, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ. And none can be justified, they are well assured, but by faith, even faith alone: seeing "to him (only) that believeth in God who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

7. What evasion now? What way could Satan take to make all this Light of none effect? What could be done when that grand truth, "By grace ye are saved through faith," was more and more generally received? What, indeed, but to persuade the very men who had received it, to "turn the Grace of God into lasciviousness?" To this end, Simon Magus appeared again, and taught "That Christ had done, as well as suffered all: That his righteousness being imputed to us, we need none of our own: That seeing there was so much righteousness and holiness in Him, there needs no more in us: That to think we have any, or to desire or seek any, is to renounce Christ: That from the beginning to the end of salvation, all is in Christ, nothing in man; and that those who teach otherwise are legal preachers, and know nothing of the gospel."

8. This is indeed "*A Blow at the Root*," the root of all holiness.

all true religion. Hereby Christ is “*Stabbed in the House of his Friends*,” of those who make the largest professions of loving and honouring Him ; the whole design of his death, namely, “to destroy the works of the Devil,” being overthrown at a stroke. For wherever this doctrine is cordially received, it leaves no place for holiness. It demolishes it from top to bottom ; it destroys both root and branch. It effectually tears up all desire of it, all endeavour after it. It forbids all such exhortations as might excite those desires, or awaken those endeavours. Nay, it makes men afraid of personal holiness, afraid of cherishing any thought of it, or motion toward it, lest they should deny the faith, and reject Christ and his righteousness. So that instead of being “zealous of good works,” they are a stink in their nostrils. And they are infinitely more afraid of the works of God, than of the works of the Devil.

9. Here is wisdom ! Though not the wisdom of the saints, but wisdom from beneath. Here is the master-piece of Satan : farther than this he cannot go. Men are holy without a grain of holiness in them ! Holy in Christ, however unholly in themselves : they are in Christ, without one jot of the mind that was in Christ. In Christ, though their nature is whole in them. They are “complete in Him,” though they are in themselves as proud, as vain, as covetous, as passionate as ever : it is enough. They may be unrighteous still, seeing Christ has “fulfilled all righteousness.”

10. O ye simple ones, “how long will ye love simplicity ?” How long will ye “seek death in the error of your life ?” “Know ye not,” whoever teacheth you otherwise, “that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God ?” “Be not deceived :” although there are many who lie in wait to deceive, and that under the fair pretence of *exalting* Christ : a pretence which the more easily steals upon you, because to you “He is precious.” But as the Lord liveth, “Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortions, shall inherit the kingdom of God.” Such indeed “were some of you. But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, as well as justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.” You are really changed : You are not only accounted, but actually made righteous. “The law,” the inward power, “of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, hath made you free,” really, actually free, “from the law (or power) of sin and death.” This is liberty, true gospel liberty, experienced by every believer : not freedom from the law of God, or the works of God, but from the law of sin, and the works of the Devil. See that ye “stand fast” in this real, not imaginary “liberty, wherewith Christ hath made you free.” And take heed ye be not “entangled again,” by means of these vain boasters, “in the yoke” of that vile “bondage” to sin, from which ye are now clean escaped. I testify unto you, that if you still continue in sin, Christ shall profit you nothing : That Christ is no Saviour to you, unless he saves you from your sins ; and that unless it purify your heart, faith shall profit you nothing. O when will ye

understand, that to oppose either inward or outward holiness, under colour of exalting Christ, is directly to act the part of Judas, to "betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" Repent, repent! lest He cut you in sunder with the two-edged sword that cometh out of his mouth! It is you yourselves that, by opposing the very end of his coming into the world, are "crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting him to an open shame." It is you that by expecting to see the Lord without holiness, through the righteousness of Christ, "make the blood of the covenant an unholy thing," keeping those unholy that so trust in it.

O beware! for evil is before you! If those who name not the Name of Christ, and die in their sins shall be punished seven-fold, surely you who thus make Christ "a minister of sin," shall be punished seventy and seven fold. What! make Christ destroy his own kingdom! Make Christ a factor for Satan! Set Christ against holiness! Talk of Christ as "saving his people in their sins!" It is no better than to say, He saves them from the guilt, and not from the power of sin. Will you make the righteousness of Christ such a cover for the unrighteousness of man? So that by this mean the unrighteous of every kind shall inherit the kingdom of God!—Stop! Consider! What are you doing? You did run well. Who hath bewitched you? Who hath corrupted you from the simplicity of Christ, from the purity of the gospel? You did know, "He that believeth is born of God:" and "whosoever is born of God sinneth not:" but while "he keepeth himself, that wicked one toucheth him not." O come back to the true, the pure, the old gospel! That which ye received in the beginning. Come back to Christ, who died to make you a holy people, "zealous of good works." "Remember from whence you are fallen, and repent and do the first works." Your "Father worketh hitherto:" do ye work; else your faith is vain. For "wilt thou know, O vain," O empty "man, that faith without works is dead?" Wilt thou know, that "though I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing?" Wilt thou know, that all the blood and righteousness of Christ, unless that "mind be in thee which was in" Him, and thou likewise "walk as Christ walked," will only increase thy damnation? "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about strife of words, whereof come railings, evil surmisings; perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth." Be no longer afraid of the strongest exhortations either to inward or outward holiness. Hereby God the Father is glorified, and God the Son truly exalted. Do not stupidly and senselessly call this *legal*, a silly, unmeaning word. Be not afraid of being "under the law of God," but of being "under the law of sin." Love the strictest preaching best, that which most searches the heart, and shows you wherein you are unlike Christ; and that which presses you most to love Him with all your heart, and serve him with all your strength.

11. Suffer me to warn you 'of another silly, unmeaning word ; Do not say, *I can do nothing*. If so, then you know nothing of Christ : Then you have no faith. For if you have, if you believe, then you "can do all things," through Christ who strengtheneth you. You can love Him, and keep his commandments : and to you his "commandments are not grievous :" Grievous to them that believe ! Far from it. They are the joy of your heart. Show then your love to Christ by keeping his commandments, by walking in all his ordinances blameless. Honour Christ, by obeying Him with all your might, by serving Him with all your strength. Glorify Christ by imitating Christ in all things, by walking as He walked. Keep to Christ, by keeping in his ways. Trust in Christ, to live and reign in your heart. Have confidence in Christ, that He will fulfil in you all his great and precious promises, that he will work in you all the good pleasure of his goodness, and all the work of faith with power. Cleave to Christ, till his blood have cleansed you from all pride, all anger, all evil desire. Let Christ do all ! Let Him that has done all *for you*, do all *in you*. Exalt Christ, as a Prince, to give repentance : a Saviour, both to give remission of sins, and to create in you a new heart, to renew a right spirit within you. This is the gospel, the pure, genuine gospel ; glad tidings of great salvation. Not the new, but the old, the everlasting gospel : the gospel, not of Simon Magus, but of JESUS CHRIST.

The GOD and FATHER of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, give you, "according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith : That, being rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the length, and breadth, and depth, and heighth ; and to know that love of Christ, which surpasseth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of GOD !"

THOUGHTS UPON NECESSITY

TO THE READER.

I HAD finished what I designed to say on this subject, when the *Essay on Liberty and Necessity* fell into my hands. A most elaborate Piece, touched and retouched with all possible care. This has occasioned a considerable enlargement of the following Tract. I would fain place mankind in a fairer point of view than that Writer has done : as I cannot believe the noblest creature in the visible world to be only a fine piece of clock-work.

IS Man a *Free-Agent*, or is he not ? Are his actions *free* or *necessary*? Is he self-determined in acting ; or is he determined by some other Being ? Is the principle which determines him to act, in himself or in another ? This is the question which I want to consider. And is it not an important one ? Surely there is not one of greater importance in the whole nature of things. For what is there that more nearly concerns all that are born of women ? What can be conceived, which more deeply affects, not some only, but every child of man ?

I. 1. That man is not self-determined, that the principle of action is lodged, not in himself, but in some other being, has been an exceedingly ancient opinion, yea, near as old as the foundation of the world. It seems, none that admit of Revelation can have any doubt of this. For it was unquestionably the sentiment of Adam, soon after he had eaten of the forbidden fruit. He imputes what he had done not to himself, but to another : *The woman whom thou gavest me.* It was also the sentiment of Eve : *The serpent he beguiled me, and I did eat.* It is true, *I did eat* : but the cause of my eating, the spring of my action, was in *another*.

2. The same opinion, That man is not self-determined, took root very early, and spread wide, particularly in the Eastern world, many ages before Manes was born. Afterwards indeed he and his followers, commonly called Manichees, formed it into a regular system. They not only maintained, that all the actions of man were necessarily determined by a power exterior to himself, but likewise accounted for it, by ascribing the good to Oromasdes, the parent of all good : the evil to the other independent Being, Arimanus, the parent of all evil.

3. From the Eastern World, "When Arts and Empire learned to travel West," this opinion travelled with them into Europe, and soon found its way into Greece. Here it was earnestly espoused and vehemently maintained by the *Stoic Philosophers* : Men of great renown among persons of literature, and some of the ablest disputants in the world. These affirmed with one mouth, That from the beginning of the world, if not rather from all eternity, there was an indissoluble chain of causes and effects, which included all human actions. And that these were by fate so connected together, that not one link of the chain could be broken.

4. A fine writer of our own country, who was a few years since gathered to his fathers, has, with admirable skill, drawn the same conclusion, from different premises. He lays it down as a principle, (and a principle it is, which cannot reasonably be denied,) That as long as the soul is vitally united to the body, all its operations depend on the body : That in particular all our thoughts depend upon the vibrations of the fibres of the brain ; and of consequence vary, more or less, as those vibrations vary. In that expression, *our Thoughts*, he comprises all our sensations, all our reflections and passions : yea, and all our volitions, and consequently our actions, which he supposes, unavoidably follow those vibrations. He premises, "But you

will say, this scheme infers the universal necessity of human actions : And frankly adds, " Certainly it does. I am sorry for it : But I cannot help it."

5. And this is the scheme which is now adopted, by not a few of the most sensible men in our nation. One of these fairly confessing, that " He did not think himself a sinner," was asked, " Do you never feel any wrong tempers ? And do you never speak or act in such a manner as your own reason condemns ?" He candidly answered, " Indeed I do. I frequently feel tempers, and speak many words, and do many actions, which I do not approve of. But I cannot avoid it. They result, whether I will or not, from the vibrations of my brain, together with the motion of my blood, and the flow of my animal spirits. But these are not in my own power. I cannot help them. They are independent on my choice. And therefore I cannot apprehend myself to be a sinner on this account."

6. Very lately another gentleman in free conversation, was carrying this matter a little farther. Being asked, " Do you believe GOD is Almighty ?" He answered, " I do ; or he could not have made the world." " Do you believe he is wise ?" " I cannot tell. Much may be said on both sides." " Do you believe he is good ?" " No. I cannot believe it : I believe just the contrary. For all the evil in the world is owing to Him : I can ascribe it to no other cause. I cannot blame that cur for barking or biting : it is his nature : and he did not make himself. I feel wrong tempers in myself. But that is not *my* fault ; for I cannot help it. It is my nature : And I could not prevent my having this nature, neither can I change it."

7. The Assembly of Divines, who met at Westminster in the last century, express very nearly the same sentiment, though placed in a different light. They speak to this effect : " Whatever happens in time, was unchangeably determined from all eternity. GOD ordained or ever the world was made, all the things that should come to pass therein. The greatest and the smallest events were equally predetermined : in particular all the thoughts, all the words, all the actions of every child of man : All that every man thinks, or speaks, or does, from his birth, till his spirit returns to God that gave it." It follows, that no man can do either more or less good, or more or less evil than he does. None can think, speak, or act, any otherwise than he does, not in any the smallest circumstance. In all, he is bound by an invisible, but more than adamantine chain. No man can move his head or foot, open or shut his eyes, lift his hand, or stir a finger, any otherwise than as GOD determined he should, from all eternity.

8. That this chain is *invisible*, they allow : Man himself perceives nothing of it. He suspects nothing less : He imagines himself to be free in all his actions. He *seems* to move hither and thither, to go this way or that, to choose doing evil, or doing good, just at his own discretion. But all this is an entire mistake, it is no more than a pleasing dream. For all his ways are fixed, as the pillars of heaven :

all unalterably determined. So that notwithstanding these gay, flattering appearances,

“In spite of all the labour we create,
We only row; but we are steer'd by Fate!”

9. A late writer, in his celebrated book upon *Free-Will*, explains the matter thus. “The soul is now connected with a material vehicle, and placed in the material world. Various objects here continually strike upon one or other of the bodily organs. These communicate the impression to the brain; consequent on which such and such sensations follow. These are the materials on which the understanding works, in forming all its simple and complex ideas: according to which our judgments are formed. And according to our judgments are our passions; our love and hate, joy and sorrow, desire and fear, with their innumerable combinations. Now all these passions together are *the will* variously modified. And all actions flowing from the will, are *voluntary actions*. Consequently they are good or evil, which otherwise they could not be. And yet it is not in man to direct his own way, while he is in the body, and in the world.”

10. The Author of an *Essay on Liberty and Necessity*, published some years since at Edinburgh, speaks still more explicitly, and endeavours to trace the matter to the foundation. “The impressions,” says he, “which man receives in the natural world, do not correspond to the truth of things. Thus the qualities called secondary, which we by natural instinct attribute to matter, belong not to matter, nor exist without us: but all the beauty of colours with which heaven and earth *appear* clothed, is a sort of romance or illusion. For in external objects there is really no other distinction, but that of the size and arrangement of their constituent parts, whereby the rays of light are variously reflected and refracted.” p. 152, &c.

“In the moral world, whatever is a cause, with regard to its proper effect, is an effect with regard to some prior cause, and so backward without end. Events therefore being a train of causes and effects, are necessary and fixed. Every one must be, and cannot be otherwise than it is.” p. 157, &c.

“And yet a feeling of an opposite kind is deeply rooted in our nature. Many things *appear* to us, as not predetermined by any invariable law. We naturally make a distinction, between things that *must be*, and things that *may be*, or *may not*.

“So with regard to the actions of men. We see that connexion between an action and its motive to be so strong, that we reason with full confidence, concerning the future actions of others. But if actions necessarily arise from their proper motives, then all human actions are necessary and fixed. Yet they do not *appear* so to us. Indeed before any particular action, we always judge, that the action will be the necessary result of some motive. But afterwards the feeling instantly varies. We accuse and condemn a man for doing what is wrong. We conceive, he had a power of acting otherwise,

and the whole train of our feelings suppose him to have been entirely a free agent."

"But what does this liberty amount to? In all cases our choice is determined by some motive. It *must be* determined by that motive, which appears the best upon the whole. But motives are not under our power or direction. When two motives offer, we have not the power of choosing as we please. We are necessarily determined."

"Man is passive in receiving impressions of things; according to which the judgment is necessarily formed. This the will necessarily obeys, and the outward action necessarily follows the will."

"Hence it appears, that God decrees all future events. He who gave such a nature to his creatures, and placed them in such circumstances, that a certain train of actions must necessarily follow: He who did so, and who must have foreseen the consequences, did certainly decree, That those events should fall out, and that men should act just as they do."

"The Deity is the first cause of all things. He formed the plan on which all things were to be governed, and put it in execution by establishing both in the natural and moral world, certain laws that are fixed and immutable. By virtue of these, all things proceed in a regular train of causes and effects, bringing about the events contained in the original plan, and admitting the possibility of no other. This universe is a vast machine winded up and set a-going. The several springs and wheels act unerringly upon one another. The hand advances and the clock strikes, precisely as the artist has determined. In this plan, man, a rational creature, was to fulfil certain ends. He was to *appear as an actor*, and to act with consciousness and spontaneity. Consequently it was necessary he should have some idea of liberty, some feeling of things possible and contingent, things depending on himself, that he might be led to exercise that activity, for which he was designed. To have seen himself a part of that great machine, would have been altogether incongruous to the ends he was to fulfil. Had he seen that nothing was contingent, there would have been no room for forethought, nor for any sort of industry or care. Reason could not have been exercised in the way it is now; that is, man could not have been man. But now, the moment he comes into the world, he acts as a free-agent. And contingency, though it has no real existence in things, is made to appear as really existing. Thus is our natural feeling directly opposite to truth and matter of fact: seeing it is certainly impossible, that any man should act any otherwise than he does."

See necessity drawn at full length, and painted in the most lively colours!

II. 1. It is easy to observe, That every one of these schemes implies the universal necessity of human actions. In this they all agree, that man is not a *free*, but a *necessary* agent, being absolutely determined in all his actions, by a principle exterior to himself. But they do not agree what that principle is. The most ancient of them, the Manichæan, maintained that men are determined to evil, by the evil

god, Arimanus: that Oromasdes, the good god, would prevent, or remove that evil, but cannot: the power of the evil god being so great that he is not able to control it.

2. The Stoicks, on the other hand, did not impute the evil that is in the world to any intelligent principle, but either to the original stubbornness of matter, which even Divine Power was not capable of removing: to the concatenation of causes and effects, which no power whatever could alter: or to unconquerable fate, to which they supposed all the gods, the Supreme not excepted, to be subject.

3. The author of two volumes entitled *Man*, rationally rejects all the preceding schemes, while he deduces all human actions from those passions and judgments, which, during the present union of the soul and body, necessarily result from such and such vibrations of the fibres of the brain. Herein he indirectly ascribes the necessity of all human actions to God: who having fixed the laws of this vital union, according to his own good pleasure; having so constituted man, that the motions of the soul thus depend on the fibres of the body, has thereby laid him under an invincible necessity of acting thus, and in no other manner. So do those likewise, who suppose all the judgments and passions necessarily to flow from the motion of the blood and spirits. For this is indirectly to impute all our passions and actions to Him, who alone determined the manner wherein our blood and spirits should move.

4. The gentleman next mentioned does this directly, without any softening or circumlocution at all. He flatly and roundly affirms, The Creator is the proper author of every thing which man does: that by creating him thus, He has absolutely determined the manner wherein he shall act; and that therefore man can no more help sinning, than a stone can help falling. The Assembly of Divines do as directly ascribe the necessity of human actions to God, in affirming, that God has eternally determined whatsoever shall be done in time. So likewise does Mr. Edwards of New England: in proving by abundance of deep metaphysical reasoning, that "we *must* see, hear, taste, feel the objects that surround us, and *must* have such judgments, passions, actions, and no other." He flatly ascribes the necessity of all our actions, to him who united our souls to these bodies, placed us in the midst of these objects, and ordered, that these sensations, judgments, passions, and actions, should spring therefrom.

5. The author last cited connects together and confirms all the preceding schemes; particularly those of the ancient Stoicks and the modern Calvinists.

III. It is not easy for a man of common understanding, especially if unassisted by education, to unravel these finely woven schemes, or show distinctly, where the fallacy lies. But he knows, he feels, he is certain, they cannot be true: that the Holy God cannot be the author of sin. The horrid consequences of supposing this, may appear to the meanest understanding from a few plain, obvious considerations, of which every man that has common sense may judge.

1. If all the passions, the tempers, the actions of men, are wholly independent on their own choice, are governed by a principle exterior to themselves, then there can be no moral good or evil. There can be neither virtue nor vice, neither good nor bad actions, neither good nor bad passions or tempers. The sun does much good: but it is no virtue: but he is not capable of moral goodness. Why is he not? For this plain reason, because he does not act from choice. The sea does much harm: it swallows up thousands of men: but it is not capable of moral badness: because it does not act by choice, but from a necessity of nature. If indeed one or the other can be said to *act* at all. Properly speaking it does not: it is purely passive: it is only acted upon by the Creator: and *must* move in this manner and no other, seeing it cannot resist HIS will. In like manner, St. Paul did much good: but it was no virtue, if he did not act from choice. And if he was in all things necessitated to think and act, he was not capable of moral goodness. Nero does much evil: murders thousands of men, and sets fire to the city: but it is no fault: he is not capable of moral badness, if he does not act from choice but necessity. Nay, properly the man does not act at all: he is only acted upon by the Creator, and *must* move thus, being irresistibly impelled. For who can resist his will?

2. Again. If all the actions, and passions, and tempers of men are quite independent on their own choice, are governed by a principle exterior to themselves, then none of them is either rewardable or punishable, is either praise or blame-worthy. The consequence is undeniable: I cannot praise the sun for warming, nor blame the stone for wounding me: because neither the sun nor the stone acts from choice, but from necessity. Therefore neither does the latter deserve blame, nor the former deserve praise. Neither is the one capable of reward, nor the other of punishment. And if a man does good as necessarily as the sun, he is no more praise-worthy than that. If he does evil as necessarily as the stone, he is no more blame-worthy. The dying to save your country is no way rewardable, if you are compelled thereto. And the betraying your country is no way punishable, if you are necessitated to do it.

3. It follows, if there be no such thing as virtue or vice, as moral good or evil, if there be nothing rewardable or punishable in the actions or passions of men, then there can be no judgment to come, and no future rewards and punishments. For might not God as well judge the trees of the wood, or the stones of the field as man, if man be as totally passive as they? As irresistibly determined to think, speak, and act thus or thus? What should he be commended or rewarded for, who never did any good, but when he could not help it, being impelled thereto by a force which he could not withstand? What should he be blamed or punished for, who never did any evil, to which he was not determined by a power he could no more resist, than he could shake the pillars of heaven?

This objection the author of the *Essay* gives in its full strength. ‘The advocates for liberty reason thus. If actions be necessary,

and not in our own power, what ground is there for blame, self-condemnation, or remorse ? If a clock were sensible of its own motions, and knew that they proceeded according to necessary laws, could it find fault with itself for striking wrong ? Would it not blame the artist, who had so ill adjusted the wheels ? So that upon this scheme, all the moral constitution of our nature is overturned. There is an end to all the operations of conscience, about right and wrong. Man is no longer a moral agent, nor the subject of praise or blame for what he does."

He strangely answers, " Certainly the pain, the remorse which is felt by any man who has been guilty of a bad action, springs from the notion, that he has a power over his own actions, that he might have forbore to do it. it is on this account, that he is angry at himself, and confesses himself to be blamable. That uneasiness proceeds on the supposition, that he is free, and might have acted a better part. And one under the dominion of bad passions is condemned upon this ground, that it was in his power to be free from them. Were not this the case, brutes might be the objects of moral blame as well as man. But we do not blame them, because they have not freedom, a power of directing their own actions. We must, therefore, admit, that the idea of freedom, is essential to the moral feeling. On the system of universal necessity, there could be no place for blame or remorse. And we struggle in vain to reconcile to this system, the testimony which conscience clearly gives to freedom."

Is this an answer to the objection ? Is it not fairly giving up the whole cause ?

He adds, " A feeling of liberty, which I now scruple not to call *deceitful*, is interwoven with our nature. Man must be so constituted, in order to attain virtue." To attain virtue ! Nay, you have yourself allowed, that on this supposition, virtue and vice can have no being. You go on. " If he saw himself as he really is," [Sir, do not you see yourself so ?] " if he conceived himself and all his actions, necessarily linked into the great chain, which renders the whole order both of the natural and moral world unalterably determined in every article, what would follow ?" Why just nothing at all. The great chain must remain as it was before : since whatever you see or conceive, that is " unalterably determined in every article."

To confute himself still more fully, he says, " If we knew good and evil to be necessary and unavoidable," [contradiction in terms ; but let it pass] " there would be no more place for praise or blame : no indignation at those who had abused their rational powers ; no sense of just punishment annexed to crimes, or of any reward deserved by good actions. All these feelings vanish at once, with the feeling of liberty. And the sense of *duty* must be quite extinguished ; for we cannot conceive any *moral obligation*, without supposing a power in the Agent over his own actions."

If so, What is he, who publishes a book, to show mankind, that they have no power over their own actions ?

'To the objection, that this scheme "makes God the author of sin," the Essayist feebly answers, "Sin, or moral turpitude, lies in the evil intention of him that commits it; or in some wrong affection. Now there is no wrong intention in God." What then? Whatever wrong intention or affection is in man, you make God the direct author of it. For you flatly affirm, "moral evil cannot exist, without being permitted of God. And with regard to a first cause, *permitting is the same thing as causing.*" That I totally deny: but if it be, God is the proper cause of all the sin in the universe.

4. Suppose now the Judge of all the earth, having just pronounced the awful sentence, *Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels*, should say to one on the left hand, "What canst thou offer, in thy own behalf?" Might he not on this scheme, answer, "Lord, why am I doomed to dwell with everlasting burnings? For not doing good? Was it ever in my power to do any good action? Could I ever do any, but by that grace which thou hadst determined not to give me? For doing evil? Lord, did I ever do any, which I was not bound to do by thy own decree? Was there ever a moment, when it was in my power, either to do good, or to cease from evil? Didst not thou fix whatever I should do, or not do, or ever I came into the world? And was there ever one hour, from my cradle to my grave, wherein I could act otherwise than I did?" Now, let any man say, Whose mouth would be stopped, that of the criminal, or the Judge?

5. But if upon this supposition, there can be no judgment to come, and no future rewards or punishments; it likewise follows, that the Scriptures, which assert both, cannot be of divine original. If there be not *a day wherein GOD will judge the world, by that man whom he hath appointed*; if the wicked *shall not go into eternal punishment*, neither the righteous *into life eternal*: what can we think of that Book, which so frequently and solemnly affirms all these things? We can no longer maintain, that *all Scripture was given by inspiration of GOD*, since it is impossible, that the God of truth, should be the author of palpable falsehoods. So that whoever asserts the pre-determination of all human actions, a doctrine totally inconsistent with the scriptural doctrines of a future judgment, heaven and hell, strikes hereby at the very foundation of Scripture, which must necessarily stand or fall with them.

Such absurdities will naturally and necessarily follow, from the scheme of necessity. But Mr. Edwards has found out a most ingenious way of evading this consequence. "I grant," (says that good and sensible man,) "if the actions of men were *involuntary*, the consequences would inevitably follow; they could not be either good or evil: nor, therefore, could they be the proper object, either of reward or punishment. But here lies the very ground of your mistake: their actions are not *involuntary*. The actions of men are quite *voluntary*: the fruit of their own *will*. They love, they desire evil things; therefore they commit them. But love and hate, desire and aversion are only several modes of *willing*. Now if men volun-

tarily commit theft, adultery, or murder, certainly the actions are evil, and therefore punishable. And if they voluntarily serve GOD, and help their neighbours, the actions are good and therefore rewardable."

7. I cannot possibly allow the consequence, upon Mr. Edwards's supposition. Still I say, if they are *necessitated* to commit robbery or murder, they are not punishable for committing it. But you answer, "Nay, their actions are voluntary, the fruit of their own will." If they are, yet that is not enough, to make them either good or evil. For their will, on *your* supposition, is irresistibly impelled: so that they cannot help willing thus or thus. If so, they are no more blamable for *that will*, than for the actions which follow it. There is no blame, if they are under a *necessity* of willing. There can be no moral good or evil, unless they have *liberty* as well as *will*, which is entirely a different thing. And the not adverting to this, seems to be the direct occasion of Mr. Edwards's whole mistake.

8. GOD created man an *intelligent* being; and endued him with *will* as well as understanding. Indeed it seems, without this, his understanding would have been given to no purpose. Neither would either his will or understanding have answered any valuable purpose, if *liberty* had not been added to them, a power distinct from both; a power of choosing for himself, a self-determining principle. It may be doubted whether GOD ever made an intelligent creature, without all these three faculties? Whether any Spirit ever existed without them? Yea, whether they are not implied in the very nature of a Spirit? Certain it is, that no being can be accountable for its actions which has not liberty, as well as will and understanding.

How admirably is this painted by Milton supposing GOD to speak concerning his new-made creature.

— "I made him just and right,
Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall.
Such I created all th' ethereal powers—
Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell.
Not free, what proof could they have given sincere
Of true allegiance, constant faith and love,
Where only what they *needs must do* appear'd,
Not what they *would*. What praise could they receive.
What pleasure I, from such obedience paid,
When Will and Reason (Reason also is Choice)
Useless and vain, of freedom both despoil'd
Made passive both, had served *Necessity*,
Not *me*? They, therefore, as to right belong'd,
So were created.—
So without least impulse or shadow of fate
Or aught by me immutably foreseen
They trespass, authors to themselves in all,
Both what they judge and what they choose: For so
I form'd them free; and free they must remain,
Till they enthrall themselves. I else must change
Their Nature and reverse the high decree,
Unchangeable, eternal, which ordain'd
Their freedom: they themselves ordain'd their fall.

Paradise Lost, Book III.

9. It seems, they who divide the faculties of the human soul into

the understanding, will, and affections, unless they make the will and affections the same thing ; (and then how inaccurate is the division ?) must mean by affections, the will properly speaking, and by the term *will*, neither more nor less than *liberty* : the power of choosing either to do or not to do, (commonly called liberty of *contradiction*,) or to do this or the contrary, good or evil, commonly called liberty of *contrariety*. Without the former at least, there can be nothing good or evil, rewardable or punishable. But it is plain, the doctrine of necessity, as taught either by the ancient Heathens, or by the moderns, (whether Deists or Christians,) destroys both, leaves not a shadow of either, in any soul of man. Consequently it destroys all the morality of human actions, making man a mere machine, and leaves no room for any judgment to come, or for either rewards or punishments.

IV. 1. But whatever be the consequences deducible from this, That all human actions are necessary, how will you answer the arguments which are brought, in defence of this position ? Let us try, whether something of this kind, may not be done in a few words.

Indeed as to the first scheme, that of the Manichees, the maintainers of a good and an evil God, though it was formerly espoused by men of renown, St. Augustine in particular ; yet it is now so utterly out of date, that it would be lost labour to confute it. A little more plausible is the scheme of the *Stoicks* building necessity upon *fate*, upon the insuperable stubbornness of *matter*, or the indissoluble *chain* of causes and effects. Perhaps they invented this scheme, to exculpate GOD ; to avoid laying the blame upon Him ; by allowing, He would have done better, if he could : that he was *willing* to cure the evil, but was not *able*. But we may answer them short, There is no fate above the most High ; that is an idle irrational fiction : neither is there any thing in the nature of *matter*, which is not obedient to his word. The Almighty is able in the twinkling of an eye, to reduce any matter into any form he pleases : or to speak it into nothing ; in a moment to expunge it out of his Creation.

2. The still more plausible scheme of Dr. Hartley, (and I might add, those of the two gentlemen above mentioned, which nearly coincide with it) now adopted by almost all who doubt of the Christian system, requires a more particular consideration, were it only because it has so many admirers. And it certainly contains a great deal of truth, as will appear to any that considers it calmly. For who can deny, that not only the memory, but all the operations of the soul are now dependent on the bodily organs, the brain in particular ? Insomuch that a blow on the back part of the head, (as frequent experience shows,) may take away the understanding, and destroy at once both sensation and reflection : and an irregular flow of spirits may quickly turn the deepest philosopher into a madman. We must allow likewise, that while the very power of thinking depends so much upon the brain, our judgments must needs depend thereon, and in the same proportion. It must be farther allowed.

that as our sensations, our reflections, and our judgments, so our will and passions also, which naturally follow from our judgments, ultimately depend on the fibres of the brain. But does all this infer the total necessity of all human actions ? "I am sorry for it, says the Dr. but I cannot help it." I verily think I can. I think, I can not only *cut* the knot, by showing (as above) the intolerable absurdities which this scheme implies : but fairly *untie* it, by pointing out just where the fallacy lies.

3. But first permit me to say a word to the author of the Essay. His grand reason, for supposing all mankind in a dream, is drawn from analogy, "We are in a continual delusion as to the natural world : Why not as to the moral?" Well : how does he prove, that we are in a continual delusion as to the natural world ? Thus. All the qualities which are termed secondary qualities, we by a natural instinct ascribe to matter. But it is a mere deceit. They do not belong to matter, neither exist without it.

As commonly as this is asserted, it is absolutely false, as will appear quickly.

You instance in colours, and confidently say, "All this beauty of colours with which heaven and earth appear to be clothed, is a sort of romance or illusion. In external objects, there is no other distinction but that of the size and arrangement of their constituent parts, whereby the rays of light are variously reflected or refracted."

But are those *rays of light* real ? And do they exist without us ? Certainly, as much as the sun does. And are the *constituent parts* of those objects real ? No body questions it. But are they really such a *size*, and *arranged* in such a manner ? They are : and what will you infer from that ? I infer, that colour is just as real as size or figure ; and that all colours do as really exist without us, as trees, or corn, or heaven, or earth. "But what do you mean by colour ?" When I say, That cloth is of a red colour, I mean, its surface is so disposed as to reflect the red (that is, the largest) rays of light. When I say, The sky is blue, I mean, it is so disposed as to reflect the blue (that is, the smallest) rays of light. And where is the delusion here ? Does not that disposition, do not those rays as really exist, as either the cloth, or the sky ? And are they not as really reflected, as the ball in a tennis court ? It is true, when they strike upon my eye, a particular sensation follows in my soul. But that sensation is not colour : I know one that calls it so. Colour therefore is a real, material thing. There is no illusion in the case, unless you confound the perception with the thing perceived. And all other Secondary qualities are just as real as figure or any other primary one. So you have no illusion in the natural world, to countenance that which you imagine to be in the moral. Wherever therefore this argument occurs, (and it occurs ten times over,) "The natural world is all illusion ; therefore so is the moral," it is just good for nothing.

But take it altogether, and what a supposition is this ! Is it not enough to make one's blood run cold ? "The Great GOD, the Creator of heaven and earth, the Father of the spirits of all flesh, the God of

Truth has encompassed with falsehood every soul that he has made! —Has given up all mankind to a strong delusion, to believe a lie: yea, all his creation is a lie, all the natural and all the moral world." If so, you make GOD himself, rather than the Devil, (horrid thought!) the Father of lies; Such you doubtless represent him, when you say not only that he has surrounded us with illusion on every side; but that the feelings which he has interwoven with our inmost nature, are equally illusive! That

" All these shadows which for things we take,
Are but the empty dreams, which in Death's sleep we make!"

And yet after this, you make a feint of disputing, in defence of a material world! Inconsistency all over! What proof have we of this, what possible proof can we have, if we cannot trust our own eyes, or ears, or any, or all of our senses? But it is certain, I can trust none of my senses, if I am a mere machine. For I have the testimony of all my outward and all my inward senses, that I am a free agent. If therefore I cannot trust them in this, I can trust them in nothing. Do not tell me, there are sun, moon, and stars, or that there are men, beasts, or birds in the world. I cannot believe one tittle of it, if I cannot believe what I feel in myself, namely, that it depends on *me*, and no other being, whether I shall now open or shut my eyes, move my head hither and thither, or stretch my hand or my foot. If I am *necessitated* to do all this, contrary to the whole, both of my inward and outward senses, I can believe nothing else, but must necessarily sink into universal scepticism.

Let us now weigh the main argument on which this author builds the melancholy hypothesis of Necessity. "Actions necessarily arise from their several motives: therefore all human actions are necessary." Again, "In all cases the choice must be determined, by that motive which appears the best upon the whole. But motives are not under our power. Man is passive in receiving impressions of things, according to which the last judgment is necessarily formed. This the will necessarily obeys, and the outward action necessarily follows the will."

Let us take this boasted argument in pieces, and survey it part by part. 1. "Motives are not under our power." This is not universally true. Some are, some are not. That man has a strong motive to run his neighbour through, namely, violent anger. And yet the action does not *necessarily* follow. Often it does not follow at all; and where it does, not necessarily; he might have resisted that motive. 2. "In all cases the choice *must* be determined by that motive which appears the best upon the whole." This is absolutely false. It is flatly contrary to the experience of all mankind. Who may not say on many occasions, *Video meliora?* I know what I do, is not "best upon the whole?" 3. "Man is passive in receiving the impressions of things." Not altogether. Even here much depends

on his own choice. In many cases he may or may not receive the impression : in most he may vary it greatly. 4. "According to these, his last judgment is necessarily formed." Nay ; this too depends much upon his choice. Sometimes his first, sometimes his last judgment, is according to the impressions which he has received : and frequently, it is not. 5. "This the will necessarily obeys." Indeed it does not. The mind has an intrinsic power, of cutting off the connexion between the judgment and the will. 6. "And the outward action necessarily follows the will." Not so. The thing I would, I do not, and the thing I would not, that I do. Whatever then becomes of the chain of events, this chain of argument has not one good link belonging to it.

3. But allowing all he contends for, That upon such vibrations of the brain, such sensations directly follow, and indirectly, (as the various combinations and results of them,) all our judgments and passions, and consequently words and actions : yet this infers no necessity at all—if there be a GOD in the world. Upon this the whole matter turns. And,

"This circumstance the Doctor had forgot." And so indeed have almost the whole tribe of modern philosophers. They do not at all take GOD into their account : they can do their whole business without him. But in truth this their wisdom is their folly : for no system, either of morality or philosophy, can be complete, unless GOD be kept in view, from the very beginning to the end. Every true philosopher will surely go at least as far as the poor Heathen Poet,

'Εκ Δι^τΘ^ρ αρχωμεθα, και εν Δι^τ ληγυετε Μωσαι.
"Muses, begin and end with GOD supreme!"

Now if there be a GOD, he cannot but have all power over every creature that he has made. He must have equal power over matter and spirits, over our souls and bodies. What are then all the vibrations of the brain to Him? Or all the *natural* consequences of them? Suppose there be *naturally* the strongest concatenation of vibrations, sensations, reflections, judgments, passions, actions : cannot He in a moment, whenever and however he pleases, destroy that concatenation? Cannot he cut off, or suspend, in any degree, the connexion between vibrations and sensations? Between sensations and reflections? Between reflections and judgments? And between judgments and passions or actions? We cannot have any idea of GOD'S omnipotence, without seeing, he can do this, if he will.

4. "If he will, you may say, we know he *can*. But have we any reason to think he *will*?" Yes ; the strongest reason in the world. supposing that *God is Love* : More especially suppose he *is loving to every man*, and that *his mercy is over all his works*. If so, it cannot be, that he should see the noblest of his creatures under heaven, necessitated to do evil, and incapable of any relief but from himself, without affording that relief. It is undeniable, that he has fixed in man, in every man, his umpire, conscience ; an inward judge, which passes sentence both on his passions and actions, either ap-

proving or condemning them. Indeed it has not power to remove what it condemns: it shows the evil which it cannot *cure*. But the GOD of Power *can* cure it: and the GOD of Love *will*,—if we choose he should. But he will no more necessitate us to be happy, than he will permit any thing beneath the sun to lay us under a necessity of being miserable. I am not careful therefore about the flowing of my blood and spirits, or the vibrations of my brain: being well assured, that however my spirits may flow, or my nerves and fibres vibrate, the Almighty GOD of Love can control them all, and will (unless I obstinately choose vice and misery) afford me such help, as in spite of all these, will put it into my power to be virtuous and happy for ever.

GLASGOW, May 14, 1774.

THOUGHTS
UPON
GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY

GOD reveals himself under a two-fold character; as a Creator, and as a Governor. These are no way inconsistent with each other: but they are totally different.

As a Creator, he has acted, in all things, according to his own sovereign will. Justice has not, cannot have, any place here; for nothing is due to what has no being. Here therefore he may, in the most absolute sense, “do what he will with his own.” Accordingly, he created the heavens and the earth, and all things that are therein, in every conceivable respect, “according to his own good pleasure.”

1. He began his creation, at what time, or rather at what part of eternity, it seemed him good. Had it pleased him, it might have been millions of years sooner, or millions of ages later.
2. He determined, by his sovereign will, the duration of the universe: whether it should last seven thousand, or seven hundred thousand, or numberless millions of years.
3. By the same, he appointed the place of the universe, in the immensity of space.
4. Of his sovereign will, he determined the number of the stars, of all the component parts of the universe, and the magnitude of every atom, of every fixed star, every planet, and every comet.
5. As Sovereign, he created the earth, with all the furniture of it, whether animate or inanimate; and gave to each such a nature, with such properties.
6. Of his own good pleasure, he made such a creature as man, and, in consequence of his spiritual nature, endued him with understanding, will, and liberty.
7. He hath determined the times for every nation to come into being,

with the bounds of their habitation. 8. He has allotted the time, the place, the circumstances, for the birth of each individual.

"If of parents I came,
That honour'd thy name,
'Twas thy goodness appointed it so."

9. He has given to each a body as it pleased him, weak or strong, healthy or sickly. This implies, 10. That he gives them various degrees of understanding, and of knowledge, diversified by numberless circumstances. It is hard to say, how far this extends: what an amazing difference there is, as to the means of improvement, between one born and brought up in a pious English family, and one born and bred among the Hottentots. Only we are sure the difference cannot be so great, as to necessitate one to be good, or the other to be evil; to force one into everlasting glory, or the other into everlasting burnings. This cannot be, because it would suppose the character of God, as a Creator, to interfere with God, as a Governor: wherein he does not, cannot possibly, act according to his own mere sovereign will; but, as he has expressly told us, according to the invariable rules both of justice and mercy.

Whether therefore we can account for it or not, (which indeed we cannot in a thousand cases) we must absolutely maintain, that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. But he cannot reward the sun for shining, because the sun is not a free-agent. Neither could he reward us, for letting our light shine before men, if we acted as necessarily as the sun. All reward, as well as all punishment, presupposes free-agency; and whatever creature is incapable of choice, is incapable of either the one or the other.

Whenever therefore God acts, as a Governor, as a Rewarder, or Punisher, he no longer acts as a mere Sovereign, by his own sole will and pleasure; but as an impartial Judge, guided in all things by invariable justice.

Yet it is true, that, in some cases, Mercy rejoices over Justice: although Severity never does. God may reward more, but he will never punish more, than strict justice requires. It may be allowed, that God acts as Sovereign, in convincing some souls of sin; arresting them in their mad career, by his resistless power. It seems also, that, at the moment of our conversion, he acts irresistibly. There may likewise be many irresistible touches, during the course of our Christian warfare: with regard to which every believer may say

"In the time of my distress,
Thou hast my succour been,
In my utter helplessness
Restraining me from sin."

But still, as St. Paul might have been either obedient or "disobedient to the heavenly vision," so every individual may, after all that God has done, either improve his grace or make it of none effect.

Whatever therefore it hath pleased God to do, of his Sovereign pleasure, as Creator of heaven and earth; and whatever his mercy may do on particular occasions, over and above what justice requires: the general rule stands firm as the pillars of heaven, "The Judge of

all the earth *will* do right." He will "judge the world in righteousness," and every man therein, according to the strictest justice. He will punish no man, for doing any thing which he could not possibly avoid; neither for omitting any thing which he could not possibly do. Every punishment supposes the offender might have avoided the offence, for which he is punished. Otherwise, to punish him would be palpably unjust, and inconsistent with the character of God our Governor.

Let then these two ideas, of God the Creator, the Sovereign Creator, and God the Governor, the Just Governor, be always kept apart. Let us distinguish them from each other, with the utmost care.

So shall we give God the full glory of his Sovereign Grace, without impeaching his inviolable justice.

THE QUESTION.

WHAT IS AN ARMINIAN?

ANSWERED.

1. TO say, "This man is an Arminian," has the same effect on many hearers, as to say, "This is a mad dog." It puts them into a fright at once: they run away from him with all speed and diligence: and will hardly stop, unless it be to throw a stone at the dreadful, mischievous animal.

2. The more unintelligible the word is, the better it answers the purpose. Those on whom it is fixed, know not what to do: not understanding what it means, they cannot tell what defence to make, or how to clear themselves from the charge. And it is not easy to remove the prejudice, which others have imbibed, who know no more of it, than that it is "something *very* bad," if not "*all* that is bad!"

3. To clear the meaning therefore of this ambiguous term, may be of use to many: to those who so freely pin this name upon others, that they may not say what they do not understand: to those that hear them, that they may be no longer abused by men saying they know not what: and to those upon whom the name is fixed, that they may know how to answer for themselves.

4. It may be necessary to observe, first, that many confound Arminians with Arians. But this is entirely a different thing: the one has no resemblance to the other. An Arian is one who denies the Godhead of Christ: we scarcely need say, the supreme, eternal Godhead; because there can be no God but the supreme, eternal God, unless we will make two gods, a great god, and a little one. Now, none have ever more firmly believed, or more strongly asserted, the Godhead of Christ, than many of the (so called) Arminians have done;

yea, and do at this day. Arminianism therefore (whatever it be) is totally different from Arianism.

5. The rise of the word was this, James Harmens, in Latin, Jacobus Arminius, was first one of the ministers of Amsterdam, and afterwards Professor of Divinity at Leyden. He was educated at Geneva; but in the year 1591, began to doubt of the principles which he had till then received. And being more and more convinced that they were wrong, when he was vested with the Professorship, he publicly taught what he believed of the truth, till in the year 1609, he died in peace. But a few years after his death, some zealous men, with the Prince of Orange at their head, furiously assaulted all that held, what were called, *his opinions*, and having procured them to be solemnly condemned, in the famous Synod of Dort, (not so numerous or learned, but fully as impartial as the Council, or Synod of Trent;) some were put to death, some banished, some imprisoned for life, all turned out of their employments, and made incapable of holding any office, either in church or state.

6. The errors charged upon these (usually termed Arminians) by their opponents, are five, 1. That they deny *Original Sin*. 2. That they deny *Justification by Faith*. 3. That they deny *Absolute Predestination*. 4. That they deny the Grace of God to be *irresistible*; and, 5. That they affirm, a believer may *fall from Grace*.

With regard to the two first of these charges, they plead, not guilty. They are entirely false. No man that ever lived, not John Calvin himself, ever asserted either *Original Sin*, or *Justification by Faith*, in more strong, more clear, and express terms, than Arminius has done. These two points, therefore, are to be set out of the question: in these both parties agree. In this respect there is not a hair's breadth difference between Mr. WESLEY and Mr. WHITEFIELD.

7. But there is an undeniable difference between the Calvinists and Arminians, with regard to the three other questions. Here they divide: the former believe *Absolute*, the latter, only *Conditional Predestination*. The Calvinists hold, 1. God has absolutely decreed, from all eternity, to save such and such persons, and no others, and that Christ died for these, and none else. The Arminians hold, God has decreed from all eternity, touching all that have the written word, "He that believeth shall be saved: he that believeth not, shall be condemned:" and in order to this, "Christ died for all, all that were dead in trespasses and sins," that is, for every child of Adam, since *in Adam all died*.

8. The Calvinists hold, Secondly, That the saving Grace of God is absolutely *irresistible*: that no man is any more able to resist it, than to resist the stroke of lightning. The Arminians hold, that, although there may be some moments wherein the Grace of God acts irresistibly, yet in general any man may resist, and that to his eternal ruin, the Grace whereby it was the will of God, he should have been eternally saved.

9. The Calvinists hold, Thirdly, That a true believer in Christ cannot possibly fall from grace. The Arminians hold, That a true

believer may "make shipwreck of faith and a good conscience;" that he may fall, not only *fouly*, but *finally*, so as to perish for ever.

10. Indeed the two latter points, Irresistible Grace, and Infallible Perseverance, are the natural consequence of the former, of the unconditional decree. For if God has eternally and absolutely decreed to save such and such persons, it follows, both, that they cannot resist his saving Grace, (else they might miss of salvation;) and that they cannot finally fall from that grace which they cannot resist. So that in effect, the three questions come into one, "Is Predestination absolute or conditional?" The Arminians believe, it is conditional: the Calvinists, that it is absolute.

11. Away then with all ambiguity: away with all expressions which only puzzle the cause. Let honest men speak out, and not play with hard words, which they do not understand: and how can any man know what Arminius held, who has never read one page of his writings? Let no man bawl against Arminians, till he knows what the term means. And then he will know that Arminians and Calvinists are just upon a level. And Arminians have as much right to be angry at Calvinists, as Calvinists have to be angry at Arminians. John Calvin was a pious, learned, sensible man: and so was James Harmens. Many Calvinists are pious, learned, sensible men: and so are many Arminians. Only the former hold absolute Predestination, the latter, conditional.

12. One word more. Is it not the duty of every Arminian preacher, first, never in public or in private, to use the word *Calvinist* as a term of reproach; seeing it is neither better nor worse than *calling names*? A practice no more consistent with good sense, or good manners, than it is with Christianity. Secondly. To do all that in him lies, to prevent his hearers from doing it, by showing them the sin and folly of it? And is it not equally the duty of every Calvinist preacher, First, never in public or in private, in preaching, or in conversation, to use the word *Arminian* as a term of reproach? Secondly, to do all that in him lies, to prevent his hearers from doing it, by showing them the sin and folly thereof? And that the more earnestly and diligently, if they have been accustomed to do it? Perhaps encouraged therein by his own example?

SOME REMARKS
ON
MR. HILL'S REVIEW OF ALL THE DOCTRINES
TAUGHT BY MR. JOHN WESLEY.

Humanum est nescire et errare.

Be calm in arguing: for fierceness makes
Error a fault, and truth courtesy.

Why should I feel another man's mistakes,

More than his sickness or infirmity?

In love I should: but anger is not love,

Nor wisdom neither; therefore gently move.

HERBERT.

1. MR. HILL has an immense advantage over me: he abounds in time, and I in business. I cannot, therefore, undertake to write page for page; I have not leisure, if I had inclination. And indeed it is not needful. For a full confutation of whatsoever is cited from the eleven Letters commonly ascribed to Mr. Hervey, I need only refer to Mr. Sellon; who has not only answered every shadow of an argument, contained in that poor piece of low invective, but even the reproaches; which, indeed, he could not pass over, without passing over a great part of the book. If Mr. Hill is *afraid* to read that answer, I am sorry for it. And for whatever he advances on particular redemption, or any of the points connected therewith, I refer every one who is not afraid of the light, to those three tracts of Mr. Sellon, "The Arguments against General Redemption answered," "God's Sovereignty vindicated against Elisha Coles," and "The Church of England vindicated from the charge of Calvinism." I believe if Mr. Hill had given this last a fair reading, he would know the 17th Article is nothing to his purpose.

2. With regard to his objections to Mr. FLETCHER, I refer all candid men to his own writings: his letters, entitled, "A First, Second, and Third Check to Antinomianism:" the rather, because there are very few of his arguments which Mr. H. even *attempts* to answer. It is true he promises "a full and particular answer to Mr. Fletcher's Second Check to Antinomianism." But it will puzzle any one to find where that answer is, except in the titlepage. And if any thing more is needful to be done, Mr. Fletcher is still able to answer for himself. But if he does, I would recommend to his consideration the advice formerly given by a wise man to his friend, "See that you humble not yourself to that man: it would hurt both him and

the cause of God." It is a pity but he had considered it sooner, and he might have escaped some keen reflections. But he did not: he imagined when he spoke or wrote in the simplicity of his heart, that his opponents would have received his words in the same spirit wherein they were spoken. No such matter: they turn them all into poison: he not only *loses his sweet words*, but they are turned into bitterness, are interpreted as mere *sneer* and *sarcasm*! A good lesson for *me*! I had designed to have transcribed Mr. F.'s character of Mr. H. and to have added a little thereto, in hope of softening his spirit. But I see it is in vain; as well might one hope to soften

"Inexorable Pluto, king of shades!"

Since he is capable of putting such a construction, even upon Mr. F.'s gentleness and mildness; since he ascribes even to him "a pen dipped in gall," what will he not ascribe to *me*? I have done, therefore, with humbling myself to these men, to Mr. H. and his associates. I have humbled myself to them for these thirty years: but will do it no more. I have done with attempting to soften their spirits: it is all lost labour. Upon men of an ingenuous temper I have been able to fix an obligation. Bishop Gibson, Dr. Church, and even Dr. Taylor were *obliged* to me for not pushing my advantage. But it is not so with these: whatever mercy you show, you are to expect no mercy from them. Mercy did I say? Alas, I expect no justice; no more than I have found already. As they have wrested and distorted my words from the beginning, so I expect they will do to the end. Mr. H.'s performance is a specimen! Such mercy, such justice I am to expect!

§. And does Mr. Hill complain of the *unhappy spirit* in which Mr. Fletcher writes? Many writers have done marvellously: *but thou excellest them all!* For forty or fifty years have I been a little acquainted with controversial writers; some of the Romish persuasion, some of our own church, some dissenters of various denominations. And I have found many among them as *angry* as he: but one so *bitter* I have not found. Or one only, the author of those "excellent letters," as Mr. H. styles them; which he particularly *admires*, (that is his word,) and the *whole spirit* of which he has drank in. This is his peculiar character, his distinguishing grace; as a writer, *his name is wormwood*. Accordingly he charges Mr. F. with a "severe acrimonious spirit," with "sneer, sarcasm, and banter, yea with notorious falsehoods, calumny, and gross perversions." (p. 2.) Nay, "I accuse you," says he; "of the grossest perversions and misrepresentations that ever proceeded from any author's pen." In the same spirit he is represented, (p. 21,) as "a slanderer of God's people and ministers, descending to the meanest quibbles, with a bitter, railing, acrimonious spirit." And, p. 27, (to go no farther,) as "using stratagem and ungenerous artifices." Although "I have treated *you*," says Mr. Hill, "with all the politeness of a gentleman, and the humility of a Christian." Amazing! And has he not treated *me* so too? At present, take but one or two instances. "Forgeries

have long passed for no crime with Mr. Wesley." (p. 27.) "He administers falsehoods and damnable heresies, rank poison, hemlock, and ratsbane. We cannot allow him any other title than that of an empiric or quack doctor." (p. 29.) Which shall we admire most here ! The gentleman or the Christian ?

4. There is something extremely odd in this whole affair. A man falls upon another, and gives him a good beating ; who, in order to be revenged, does not grapple with *him*, (perhaps sensible that he is above his match,) but giving him two or three kicks, falls upon a third man that was standing by. "O, says he, but I know that fellow well ; he is the *second* of him that beat me." "If he is, despatch your business with the former first, and then turn to him." However, if Mr. H. is resolved to fall upon *me*, I must defend myself as well as I can.

5. From the *spirit* and *manner* wherein he writes, let us now proceed to the *matter*. But that is so various, and scattered up and down for a hundred and fifty pages, without much order or connexion, that it is difficult to know where to begin. However all tends to one point ; the good design of the writer is to *blacken*. With this laudable view, he observes the old rule, "throw dirt enough, and some will stick." Knowing that the mud may be thrown in a trice ; but it will take time and pains to scrape it off. Indeed he takes true pains to fasten it on ; to represent Mr. W as a knave and a fool ; a man of no conscience, and no understanding. It is true the latter is insisted on most at large ; by a hundred instances Mr. H. has made it plain to all the world, that Mr. W. never had three grains of common sense ; that he is the veriest weathercock that ever was ; that he has not wit enough to be fixed in any thing, but is "tost to and fro continually ;" "that he is to this very moment so absolutely unsettled with regard to every fundamental doctrine of the gospel, that no two disputants in the schools can be more opposite to each other than he is to himself."

6. But some may naturally ask, What is the matter ? What makes Mr. H. so warm ? What has Mr. W done, that this gentleman, this Christian, *ita gladiatorio animo ad eum affectat viam* ? That he falls upon him thus outrageously, dagger out of sheath, without either rhyme or reason ? O, the matter is plain. Besides that he is Mr. F.'s friend, he is an Arminian : and nothing is bad enough for an Arminian. An Arminian ! What is that ? "I cannot tell exactly : but to be sure it is all that is bad. For a Popish friar, a Benedictine monk, bears witness, (and Mr. H. avers the same,) that the tenets of the church of Rome are nearer by half to Calvinism than to Arminianism ; nearer by half to Mr. H.'s tenets than to Mr. W's." Truly I always thought so. But still I ask, What is an Arminian ? Why, in other words, an *election-doubter*. And the "good old preacher," (says Mr. H.) "places all *election-doubters*, (i. e. those who are not clear in the belief of absolute predestination,) among the numerous hosts of the Diabolonians. One of these being brought before the judge, the judge tells him, To question election, is to

overthrow a great doctrine of the gospel.—Therefore he, the election-doubter, must die," (p. 37.) That is plainly, he must die eternally, for this damnable sin. The very same thing Mr. H. affirms elsewhere, (p. 39,) "The only cement of Christian union is the love of God, and the foundation of that love *must be laid* in believing the *truths of God* :" (that is, you *must believe* particular redemption, or it is impossible you should love God,) for, to use "The words of Dr. Owen, in his Display of Arminianism, (see the *truths* which Mr. H. means!) an agreement without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ."

7. I am sorry Mr. H. should think so. But so long as he remains in that sentiment, what peace am I, or Mr. F., or indeed any Arminian, to expect from him? Since any agreement with *us* would be "a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ." I therefore give up all hopes of peace with him, and with all that are thus minded. For I do not believe what he terms *the truths of God*, the doctrine of absolute predestination. I never did believe it, nor the doctrines connected with it, no, not for an hour. In this, at least, I have been consistent with myself. I have never varied a hair's breadth: I cannot, while I believe the Bible, while I believe either the Old or New Testament. What I do believe, and always have believed in this matter, I will declare with all simplicity.

"1. I believe no decree of *reprobation*. I do not believe the Father of spirits ever

"Consign'd one unborn soul to hell,
Or damn'd him from his mother's womb."

"2. I believe no decree of *preterition*, which is only reprobation whitewashed. I do not believe God ever sent one man into the world, to whom he had decreed, never to give that grace, whereby alone he could escape damnation.

"3. I do not believe, (what is only preterition, or reprobation in other words,) any such *absolute election*, as implies that all but the *absolutely elect* shall inevitably be damned.

"4. I do not believe the doctrine of *irresistible grace*, or of *infallible perseverance*; because both the one and the other implies that election, which cannot stand without preterition or reprobation.

"5. I do not believe *salvation by works*. Yet if any man can prove, (what I judge none ever did, or ever will,) that there is no medium between this and absolute predestination; I will rather subscribe to this than to that, as far less absurd of the two."

8. *Hinc illæ lachrymae.* Here is the source of Mr. H.'s implacable hatred to *me*. And hence arises his vehement displeasure at those *Minutes*, which Mr. Shirley and he style "dreadful heresy." The appellation is just, suppose (as Mr. H. asserts) all *election-doubters* are Diabolonians: suppose no man who is "not clear in the belief of absolute predestination," can love either God or his neighbour. For it is certain the doctrine of the *Minutes* and of the *Decrees* cannot stand together. If the doctrine of the decrees stands,

then that of the minutes must fall; for we willingly allow, that the one is incompatible with the other. If the doctrine of the minutes stands, then that of the decrees must fall. For it is manifest that this, particularly the last article, strikes at the very root of Calvinism. Of what consequence is it then, to one who is persuaded the belief of Calvinism is *essential to salvation*, to expose those Minutes to the uttermost, as well as any that dares to defend them?

9. In order to this good end, Mr. H. publishes "A Review of *all the Doctrines taught by Mr. John Wesley*." But is it possible for any man to do this, without reading *all the writings* that I have published? It is not possible in the nature of things: he cannot give an account of what he never read. And has Mr. H. read *all that I have published*? I believe he will not affirm it. So any man of understanding may judge, before he opens his book, what manner of review it is likely to contain! However, it must be owned that he and his faithful allies have been at the pains of looking into many of my writings. I say many: for I apprehend there are many more, which they have not so much as *looked into*; nor does it appear that they have seriously *looked through* any, so as to observe the scope and tenor of them. However, from those which he or they have, after a fashion, reviewed, abundance of objections are extracted. It is true, none of them (one only excepted) are new, and there is hardly one that has not been answered again and again. Yet since they are proposed in a new form, they may seem to demand a new answer.

10. The grand objection is, that I am inconsistent with myself. This therefore I shall particularly consider. The others, which flutter up and down the whole work, I can but just touch upon. Mr. H. opens the charge thus: "Saying and unsaying is nothing new with Mr. W., who has only shown himself consistent, by a regular series of inconsistencies." (p. 3.) "How full are you of contradictions to yourself! How full of contrary purposes! How often do you chide with yourself! How oft do you fight with yourself!" (Titlepage.) "Mr. W seems well contented you should settle his creed. If you can, you will do in a few months, what he himself has not been able to effect in near forty years." "On this fluctuating ocean he has been tossed for so many years together." (p. 20.) "All his Journals and Tracts are replete with proofs of his having been tossed from one system to another, and from one opinion to another, from the time of his ordination to this present moment." (p. 143.) "The most ignorant collier can immediately see his inconsistency with himself." (p. 145.) He sums up the whole charge in the lively words of Mr. Cudworth, graced with the name of Mr. Hervey: "Contradiction, didst thou ever know so trusty a friend, so faithful a devotee? Many people are ready enough to contradict others. But it seems all one to this gentleman whether it be another or himself, so he may but contradict."

11. To prove this indictment, (urged home enough, though there is not one tittle of truth in it) Mr. H. has cited no less than a hun-

ired and one witnesses.* Before I enter upon the examination of these, I beg leave to transcribe what I wrote some time since to Dr Rutherford. "You frequently charge me with evasion; and others have brought the same charge. The plain case is this, I have written on various heads, and always as clearly as I could. Yet many have misunderstood my words, and raised abundance of objections I answered them by explaining myself, showing what I did not mean, and what I did. One and another of the objectors stretched his throat, and cried out, 'Evasion! Evasion!' And what does all this outcry amount to? Why exactly thus much. They imagined they had tied me so fast, that it was impossible for me to escape. But presently the cobwebs were swept away, and I was quite at liberty. And I bless God I can unravel truth and falsehood, although artfully twisted together. Of *such evasion* I am not ashamed. Let them be ashamed who constrain me to use it."

12. Mr. H.'s numerous proofs of my contradicting myself, may be ranged under twenty-four heads. I shall examine these one by one, in what appears to me to be the most natural order.

I.

1. There was an everlasting covenant between God the Father and God the Son, concerning man's redemption. There never was any such covenant between God the Father and God the Son. (p. 128.)

The latter of these I believe, and always did, since I could read my Bible.

But Mr. H. brings a passage out of the Christian Library, to contradict this. On which he parades as follows: "If the Christian Library be, as Mr. W. affirms, *all true, all agreeable to the word of God,* then what are we to think of his other works? They must be an adulteration of man's devising." (p. 128.) "The same may be said of the Minutes: if these be truly orthodox, *upwards of forty volumes* of the Library must be thoroughly heterodox. And then there is great reason to lament, that so many poor people's pockets should be fleeced for what can do their souls no good."

Peremptory enough! But let us examine the matter more closely. "Mr. W. affirms, that the Christian Library is *all true, all agreeable to the word of God.*" I do not; and I am glad I have this public opportunity, of explaining myself concerning it. My words are, (Preface, p. 4,) "I have made, as I was able, an attempt of this kind. I have endeavoured to extract such a collection of English divinity, as *I believe*, is all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God." I did believe, and I do believe *every tract* therein to be true, and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this, (as Mr. H. asserts,) of every sentence contained in the fifty volumes. I could not possibly affirm it for two reasons, 1. I was obliged to prepare most of those tracts

* The very number of propositions extracted out of Quesnell's writings, and condemned "as dreadful heresies," in the Bull *Unigenitus!* *Exemplum placet!* See how good wits jump! Mr. H., Father Walsh, and the Pope of Rome!

for the press just as I could snatch time in travelling, nor transcribing them; (none expected it of me,) but only marking the lines with my pen, and altering or adding a few words here and there, as I had mentioned in the preface. 2. As it was not in my power to attend the press, that care necessarily devolved on others; through whose inattention a hundred passages were left in, which I had scratched out: yet not so many as to make up "forty volumes," no, nor forty pages. It is probable too, I myself might overlook some sentences, which were not suitable to my own principles. It is certain, the correctors of the press did this, in not a few instances. I shall be much obliged to Mr. H. and his friends, if they will point out all those instances; and I will print them as an *Index Expurgatorius* to the work, which will make it doubly valuable.

The plain inference is, if there are a hundred passages in the Christian Library, which contradict any or all of my doctrines, these are no proof that I contradict myself. Be it observed, once for all, therefore, citations, from the Christian Library, prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors.

II.

For election and perseverance.	Against election and perseverance. (p. 101.)
--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------

2. Mr. Sellon has clearly showed that the 17th article, does not assert *absolute predestination*. Therefore in denying this, I neither contradict that article, nor myself.

3. I believe there is a state attainable in this life, from which a man <i>cannot finally fall</i> .	But I never thought a babe in Christ was in that state, though he is a true believer.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4. Saved <i>beyond the dread of falling</i> .	So says my brother. That is nothing to me.
-----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------

The note adds, "Mr. W drew lots, whether or not he should preach against the 17th article."

That paltry story is untrue. Though Mr. H. potently believes it. So all the witticisms built upon it, fall to the ground at once. I never preached against the 17th article, nor had the least thought of doing it. But did Mr. Hill never preach against the 31st article, which explicitly asserts universal redemption?

5. I do not deny, that those eminently styled <i>the elect</i> , shall infallibly persevere.	I mean, those that are <i>perfected in love</i> , (1 John iv. 17,) and those only. So here is no contradiction.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6. The love divine, Which made us thine, Shall keep us thine for ever.	So my brother speaks. But his words cannot prove that <i>I</i> contradict myself.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7. From all eternity with love. <i>Unchangeable</i> thou hast me view'd.	I believe this is true on the supposition of <i>faith foreseen</i> , not otherwise.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8. Never again will he take him away.	They are my brother's words, not mine.
---------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

... Jesus the lover of his own, will love me to the end.

10. Christ is in the *elect world* of his church.

The nine witnesses therefore examined on this head, prove just nothing at all. So that hitherto there is not the least proof, that I contradict myself.

So are these.

This is cited from the *Christian Library*. So it goes for nothing.

III.

For imputed righteousness.

11. We no more *deny the phrase* (of imputed righteousness) than the thing.

12. *This doctrine* I have believed and taught, for near eight and twenty years.

13. This is a citation from the *Christian Library*. So it goes for nothing.

14. I continually affirm, that the righteousness of Christ (in the sense there explained) is imputed to every believer.

15. This is another citation from the *Christian Library*. So it proves nothing.

16. The wedding garment is Christ's righteousness, first imputed, and then implanted.

17. This is consistent with our being justified through the imputation of Christ's righteousness.

(observe it once for all !) does not prove, that I contradict myself. I am no way engaged, to defend *every expression* of either John Goodwin or Richard Baxter's Aphorisms. The *sense* of both I generally approve, the *language* many times I do not.

But I observe here, and in fifty other instances, Mr. H. mentions no page. Now (in controversy) he that names no page, has no right to any answer.

18. I frequently put this expression *into the mouth of a whole congregation*: that is, I sing a hymn wherein it occurs.

Against imputed righteousness.

Do not dispute for that particular *phrase*. Here is no contradiction. I do not deny it; yet I dare not *dispute* for it.

The use of *that term* has done immense hurt.

It has: but here is no contradiction.

Where is the use of *contending so strenuously for those expressions*? I ask it again. But where is the contradiction.

The wedding garment is holiness.—This does not exclude, but presupposes the other.

John Goodwin contradicts this. Perhaps so. But John Goodwin is not John Wesley. Whatever therefore he says,

I dare not *require any to use it*.—True; but here is no contradiction. I do not *require any to use it*. Every one in the congregation may use or let it alone.

Here comes in a thundering note. “Although most of these extracts from Mr. W's sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6, have a very evangelical

appearance, yet all *their excellency vanisheth away*, when we are told in the same sermon, that the righteousness he contends for, is not the divine righteousness of Christ, but his human righteousness. When we consider the express words of the text, *The Lord our Righteousness*, one might wonder (if any thing is to be wondered at that Mr. W. affirms) how he could possibly fall into an error, which at once not only destroys the meritorious efficacy of the Redeemer's righteousness, but undermines the virtue of his atoning blood." This is home: Mr. H. has broken my head sadly. But he will soon give me a plaster: "However, if Mr. W. will acknowledge, that by Christ's human righteousness he means that mediatorial righteousness which was wrought by God in the human nature, I entirely acquiesce with him on the point." This is truly marvellous! Why what could Mr. W. mean beside? So this error proves to be no error at all! And *all the excellency* which *vanished away*, appears again *in statu quo*!

But we are not come to the end of the note yet, it contains another dreadful objection. "Mr. W. is unwilling" (truly I am) "to be ranked among the *Diabolonians*, and therefore with more prudence than candour, has left the whole passage concerning the *Election-doubters*, out of the *Holy War*." And if Mr. H. had omitted it too, it would have been no more an impeachment of his prudence, than it was of my candour, to omit in all the tracts I abridged, whatever I disapproved of. This was what I professed at my setting out. "I have endeavoured (these are my very words) "to preserve a consistency throughout, that no part might contradict any other. But in order to this, I have been obliged to omit the far greatest part of several authors.—And in a design of this nature I apprehend myself to be at full liberty so to do," (Preface, p. 5.) The *abridged Bunyan* is not therefore "the *counterfeit Bunyan*." This is a flourish of Mr. H.'s pen.

19. This instance sets nothing against nothing, the *Christian Library against John Goodwin*.

20. This is an emblem of the righteousness of the saints, both of their justification and sanctification.

21. I would address myself to you, who are so ready to condemn all that use *these expressions as Antinomians*.

But I do not condemn him as an *Antinomian*. Therefore here is no contradiction.

John Goodwin contradicts this. So he may: but I am not John Goodwin. So we have examined twenty witnesses; and not one of all these proves, that I contradict myself.

On Mr. Hervey's using one of them, Mr. W. says, Why are you at such pains to increase the number of Antinomians?

22. Again. Is not this, that *Christ has satisfied the demands of the law, the very quintessence of Antinomianism?*

Whether it is or not, it is wide of the mark: for this is none of the expressions in question.

23. Again. To say *the claims of the law are all answered*, is not this Antinomianism without a mask?

Yes; but it is none of the *expressions in question*. So it is no contradiction.

24. Once more. There are many expressions in this dialogue, which directly lead to Antinomianism?

So I think. Yet I do not *condemn all that use them, as Antinomians*. So here is no contradiction still.

25. It is by faith we build on this foundation, the imputed righteousness of Christ.

If faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ is a *fundamental* principle, what becomes of all those who think nothing about imputed righteousness?

Here is no contradiction. Suppose I build my faith on this *foundation*, the imputed righteousness of Christ, it does not follow, it is so fundamental a principle, that all who think nothing about it, will be damned.

26. But is not a believer clothed with the righteousness of Christ? Undoubtedly he is.

Goodwin, i. e. Nothing.

27. The mantle of Christ's righteousness. Christian Library.

Goodwin again. Nothing against nothing.

28. Christian Library.

Nothing.

29. The sole cause of our acceptance with God is the righteousness, and the death of Christ, who *fulfilled God's law*, and died in our stead.

I cannot prove, that it was requisite for Christ to *fulfil the moral law*, in order to his purchasing redemption for us. By his sufferings alone the law was satisfied.

Undoubtedly it was. Therefore, although I believe *Christ fulfilled God's law*, yet I do not affirm he did this, to *purchase redemption* for us. This was done by his dying in our stead.

30. Verses of C. W

Let him answer.

31, 32, 33. Title to Life. Christian Library. Nothing.

John Goodwin. Nothing.

34. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to every one that believes.

Ditto.

Here follows another thundering note: "When Mr. Wesley preached this sermon, he told the congregation, *It was the same doctrine which Mr. Romaine, Mr. Madan, and Mr. Whitefield, preached.*" So it was; Mr. Wh. did, Mr. R. and Mr. Madan do preach the doctrine contained in that sermon, namely, that "we are justified

ed, sanctified, and glorified, merely for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered for us." But did I say, this was all the doctrine which they preached? No; and no man in his senses could understand me so. I did not therefore "impose on the credulity of my hearers, by making them believe" any more than was strictly true.

But "did they ever hold the tenets pleaded for in the books published by Mr. W?" Whether they did or not, is out of the present question: they did and do hold the doctrine contained in that sermon. "Mr. W knows, they from their hearts subscribe to Mr. Hervey's eleven letters." I hope not: from any that do, I expect no more mercy than from a mad dog. "But if he had constantly preached that doctrine, how came so many to testify their surprise at that discourse?" Because God set it home upon their hearts. Hence it appeared new, though they had heard it over and over. "How came they to press the printing of it, in order to stop the mouths of gain-sayers?" Because they judged it would affect others as it affected them; though I never thought it would. "Lastly, if Mr. W had constantly maintained this doctrine, why must poor John Bunyan be embowelled, to make him look like Mr. W?" No: his Calvinism is omitted, to make him like the authors going before him; "to preserve a consistency throughout the work:" which still is not done as I could wish. However, those that are fond of his bowels may put them in again, and swallow them as they would the trail of a woodcock.

35. They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed, (I mean, who truly believe,) are made righteous by the Spirit of Christ.

The nice, metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteousness, instead of furthering men in holiness, makes them satisfied without any holiness at all.

I have known a thousand instances of this. And yet "they who truly believe in Christ are made righteous by his Spirit." Where is the contradiction between these propositions?

36. Christian Library.

Nothing.

37. Christ is now the righteousness of all that truly believe.

Baxter's Aphorisms go for nothing. Richard Baxter is not J. W.

38, 39, 40, } Nothing

Nothing.

41, 42, 43, } against

Nothing.

44. To all believers the righteousness of Christ is imputed.

Goodwin. Nothing.

We have now examined four and forty witnesses: but still have no proof, that I contradict myself, either with regard to the *coram electione*, and *perseverance*, or the *imputed righteousness of Christ*. With regard to this, the thing that we are justified merely for the sake of what Christ has *done and suffered*, I have constantly and earnestly maintained, above four and thirty years. And I have frequently used the phrase, hoping thereby to *please others, for their good to edification*. But it has had a contrary effect, since so many improve it into an objection. Therefore I will use it no more, unless it occur in a

nymn, or steal upon me unawares : I will endeavour to use only such phrases as are *strictly scriptural*. And I will advise all my brethren, all who are in connexion with me throughout the three kingdoms, to lay aside that ambiguous, unscriptural phrase, which is so liable to be misinterpreted, and to speak in all instances, this in particular. *as the oracles of God.*

IV

Suffering the penalty is not all the law requires.

45. So says the Christian Library.

But this does not prove that I contradict myself.

V

St. Paul speaks of the law as a person.

46. The law is here spoken of as a *person, to which as to a husband, life and death are ascribed.*

There is no contradiction here. I do affirm, St. Paul speaks of the law, "as a person to which as a husband, life and death are ascribed." But I deny, that he speaks of it "as a person injured and to be satisfied."

VI.

For a two-fold justification.

47. Mr. F affirms justification is two-fold.

Most true. And yet our Lord (Matt. xii. 37.) speaks of another justification. Now I think one and one make two.

VII.

For a justified state.

48. The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious.

Against a justified state, (p. 139.)

Does not talking of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men ? It frequently does. But where is the contradiction ?

VIII.

They who are once justified are justified for ever.

49. *Christian Library.* Nothing.

They who are justified, may become total apostates.

IX.

Works are a condition of justification, (p. 134.)

Works are not a condition of justification.

50. *Salvation* (i. e. glory) is not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.

This proposition does not speak of justification. So it is nothing to the purpose.

Whoever desires to find favour with God, should *cease from evil and learn to do well*. Whoever repents should do *works meet for repentance*. And if this is not in order to find favour, what does he do them for.

All this I believe still. "But find favour with God should *cease from evil and learn to do well*," &c. Does not the Bible say so? Who can deny it? Nay but Mr. W asks, "If this be not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?" And I ask it again. Let Mr. H. or any one else, give me an answer. So if there is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul.

X.

Against justification by the act of believing.

54. But do not you put faith in the room of Christ, and his righteousness? No: I take particular care to *put each of these in its proper place*.

This is *putting each of these in its proper place*. The righteousness of Christ is the *meritorious cause* of our justification. That is its proper place. Faith in him that gave himself for us, is the condition of justification. That is its proper place.

I am justified through the righteousness of Christ as the *price*. Through faith as the *condition*. I do not say, neither does Goodwin, faith is that, for which we were accepted. But we both say, faith is that through which we are accepted. We are justified, we are accepted of God, for the sake of Christ, through faith. Now certainly there is no contradiction in this; unless a contradiction to Mr. H.'s notions.

55. Although we have faith, hope, and love, yet we must renounce the *merit* of all, as far too weak to *deserve* our justification; for which we must trust only to the *merits* of Christ.

I believe no good works can be previous to *justification*; nor consequently a condition of it.

51. If a man could be holy, before he was justified, it would set his justification aside.

52. Thou canst do nothing but sin, till thou art justified.

53. We allow, that God justifies the ungodly, him that to that hour is full of all evil, void of all good; and him that worketh not, till that moment worketh no goodness.

Mr. W says, whoever desires to find favour with God should *cease from evil and learn to do well*," &c. Does not the Bible say so? Who can deny it? Nay but Mr. W asks, "If this be not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?" And I ask it again. Let Mr. H. or any one else, give me an answer. So if there is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul.

X.

For justification by the act of believing.

The faith which is said to be imputed to Abraham for righteousness, is faith properly taken; and not the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith.

That which is the *condition* of justification, is not the righteousness of Christ.

Most true: otherwise we confound the *condition* with the *meritorious cause* spoken of in the opposite column.

XI.

Justification by faith alone is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*. All who do not hold it must perish everlasting.

56. Of this may be affirmed, (what Luther affirms of justification by faith,) that it is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*, the pillar of that faith of which alone cometh salvation; that faith which unless a man keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlasting.

It is certain here is a *seeming* contradiction: but it is not a *real* one. For these two opposite propositions do not speak of *the same thing*. The latter speaks of *justification by faith*: the former, of *trusting in the righteousness or merits of Christ*: (justification by faith is only mentioned incidentally in a parenthesis.) Now although Mr Law denied justification by faith; he might *trust in the merits of Christ*. It is this, and this only that I affirm, (whatever Luther does,) to be *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*.

XII.

Mr. W is a *Calvinist* in the point of justification.

57. I think on *justification* just as I have done these seven and twenty years, and just as Calvin does.

We still agree with him, that the merits of Christ are the *cause* of faith the *condition* of justification.

XIII.

58. I have occasionally used those expressions, *imputed righteousness*, the *righteousness of Christ*, and the like. But I never used them in any other sense than that wherein Calvin does.

59. Mr. W does approve the expression *why me?*

My brother uses it in a hymn.

This proof halts on both feet. “But why did not Mr. W strike out of Mr. F.'s manuscript, the honourable expressions concerning himself?” Because he thought them a proper counter-balance to the contumelious expressions of Mr. H.

Justification by faith alone is not *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*. Some may doubt of it, yea, deny it, and yet not perish everlasting. (p. 127)

A pious churchman who has not *clear conceptions* of justification by faith, may be saved; yea, a mystic, (Mr. Law, for instance,) who denies justification by faith. If so, the doctrine of justification by faith is not *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*.

Mr. W has leaned too much toward *Calvinism* in this point.

We have leaned too much toward Calvinism. (p. 141.)

But not in *this point*: not as to justification by faith.

Goodwin. Nothing.

Mr. W. does not approve the expression *why me?*

Mr. F says, Mr. W doubts concerning it. (p. 140.)

XIV.

Our sin is imputed to Christ, and Christ's righteousness to us. | Our sin is not imputed to Christ, nor Christ's righteousness to us. (p. 140.)

60. } *Christian Library.*
61. } *Nothing.*

XV

62. Both Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness are imputed. (p. 131.)

63. Nothing against nothing.

In what sense I believe the Christian Library to be *all true*, I have declared above.

XVI.

Mr. W holds free-will.

64. Mr. F holds free-will.

Mr. W wonders how any man can hold free will.

Mr. W denies it.

This may prove that Mr. W contradicts Mr. F. but it can never prove that he contradicts himself. But indeed both Mr. F and Mr. W absolutely deny *natural* free-will. We both steadily assert, that the will of man is *by nature* free only to evil. Yet we both believe, that every man has a measure of free-will restored to him *by grace*

XVII.

For the doctrine of Merit.

65. "We are rewarded according to our works, yea, because of our works. How does this differ from, for the sake of our works? And how differs this from *Secundum merita operum*, or as our works *deserve*? Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot." —I say so still. Let Mr. H. if he can.

And all this is no more than to say, Take the word *merit* in a *strict* sense, and I utterly renounce it. Take it in a *looser* sense, and though I never use it, yet I do not condemn it. Therefore with regard to the word *merit*, I do not contradict myself at all.

XVIII.

For a single life.

66. Mr. W says, his thoughts on a single life are just the same they have been these thirty years. (p. 136.)

67. He advises, that we should pray against marriage.

Against the doctrine of Merit.

And yet I still maintain, "There is no *merit*, taking the word strictly, but in the blood of Christ: that salvation is not by the *merit* of works. And that there is nothing we are, or have, or do, which can, strictly speaking, *deserve* the least thing at God's hand."

Against a single life.

Why then did Mr. W marry? —For reasons best known to himself.

I advise single persons to pray. "That they may prize the advantages they enjoy."

Be this right or wrong, still here is no contradiction.

XIX.

For gay apparel.

68. To make it a point of conscience, to differ from others, (as the Quakers do,) in the *shape* or *colour* of their apparel, is mere superstition.

Against gay apparel.

Let a single intention to please God prescribe both what clothing you should buy, and the manner wherein it shall be made. *ibid.*—This I stand to.

Wear nothing of a *glaring colour*, or made in the very *height* of the fashion.

So I advise: but I do not make it a point of conscience. So here is no contradiction still.

XX.

Against tea.

69. Mr. W published a tract against drinking tea, and told the tea-drinkers, he would set them an example in that piece of self-denial.

For tea.

I did set them an example for twelve years. Then at the close of a consumption, by Dr. Fothergill's direction, I used it again.

But must not a man be sadly in want of argument, who stoops so low as this?

XXI.

For baptism by sprinkling.

70. As there is no clear proof of *dipping* in Scripture, so there is very probable proof to the contrary.

Against baptism by sprinkling.

When Mr. W baptized Mrs. L. S. he held her so long under water, that her friends screamed out, thinking she had been drowned.

When? Where? I never heard of it before.

Why then did you at Savannah baptize all children by immersion, unless the parents certified they were weak?

Not because I had any scruple, but in obedience to the rubric. So here is no self-inconsistency.

XXII.

Mr. Wesley never adopted Mr. Law's scheme.

Mr. W highly approved of Mr. Law.

These propositions are not contradictory. I might *highly approve* of him, and yet not *adopt his scheme*. How will Mr. H. prove that I did? Or that I contradict myself on this head? Why thus:

72. I had been eight years at Oxford, before I read any of Mr. Law's writings. And when I did, I was so far from making them

To instruct a person in the nature of Christianity, I fixed an hour a day, to read with her in Mr. Law's treatise on Christian

my creed, that I had objections, to almost evry page, p. 135.

Perfection. I did so. And an excellent book it is, though liable to many objections.

73. Another little company of us met: we sung, read a little of Mr. Law, and then conversed.

True; but neither does this prove that I *adopted his scheme*.

73. I believe the *mystic* writers, to be one great Antichrist.

74. Mr. F affirms, Solomon is the chief of *mystics*: and Mr. W acquiesces in the affirmation.

I retract this. It is far too strong. But observe! I never contradicted it till now.

I do not. I affirm no such thing. Therefore all Mr. H. builds upon this, is only a castle in the air.

XXIII.

Enoch and Elijah are in heaven.

75. Enoch and Elijah entered at once into the highest degree of glory.

Enoch and Elijah are not in heaven.

Enoch and Elijah are not in heaven, but only in paradise. (p. 138.)

Notes on the New Testament, John iii. 13. first edition.

But why is Mr. H. so careful to name the first edition? Because in the second the mistake is corrected. Did he know this? And could he avail himself of a mistake, which he knew was removed before he wrote!

XXIV

For sinless perfection. | Against sinless perfection.

Upon this head Mr. H. employs his whole strength. I will, therefore, the more carefully weigh what he advances: only premising, before I descend to particulars, two general observations.

1. Out of the twenty-five passages cited for *perfection*, seventeen are taken from my brother's hymns. These, therefore, strike wide. Whatever they prove, they cannot prove, that I contradict *myself*.

2. Out of the twenty-five cited against perfection, fourteen are cited from the sermon on *sin in believers*. Do I mean, in such *believers* as are *perfected in love*? Mr. H. himself knows I do not. Why then every one of these fourteen arguments, is an abuse both upon me and his readers. It is the most egregious trifling that can be conceived. I affirm, "Those perfected in love, are saved from inward sin." To prove I contradict myself herein, fourteen passages are alleged. wherein I affirm, "We are not saved from inward sin, till we are perfected in love!"

3. The same fallacy is used in every instance, when some of my words are set in opposition to others. The sum is, weak *believers*, babes in Christ, are not; *adult believers*, are saved from inward sin. And I still aver, there is no contradiction in this, if I know what a contradiction means.

Now to the proofs.

76. The Son hath made them, who are *thus born of God*, free from *pride*.

They? Who? Not those who are thus born of God, who are perfected in love.

77. From the iniquity of *pride* and *self*, I shall be free.

That is, when I am perfected in love.

78. They are freed from *wanderings* in prayer.

79. Christians are saved from *all sin*, from *all unrighteousness*.

80. They (adult Christians) are freed from all *evil thoughts* and *evil tempers*.

81. They (fathers in Christ) are freed from evil thoughts.

82. Christ was free from sinful thoughts. So are they likewise (adult believers.)

83. I believe, some would say, "We trust we do keep *the whole law of love*."

The reader will please to remember all along, the question is not, Whether the doctrine be right or wrong: (that has been elsewhere considered) but whether I contradict myself. Upwards of fourscore witnesses have been already examined on this head: but no contradiction is proved yet.

84. Some do love God with *all their heart and strength*.

85. *From that hour*, in-dwelling sin, thou hast no place in me.

86. A sinless life we live.

87. While *one evil thought* can rise, I am not born again.

They are sensible of pride remaining in their hearts.

They? Who? Not those who are thus born of God, who are perfected in love.

God's children are daily sensible of pride and self-will. That is, till they are perfected in love.

Is this spoken of all believers? Mr. H. knows it is not.

True, adult Christians.

The (infant) children of God have in them sin of every kind.

The evil nature opposes the Spirit even in believers—till they are fathers in Christ.

This doctrine (that all believers are thus free) is wholly new.

Believers are conscious of not fulfilling the whole law of love: not till they are perfected in love.

They (weak believers) do not love God with all their heart and strength.

Believers are not delivered from the being of sin till that hour.

Christian Library, nothing.

My brother said so once: I never did.

In the note annexed, there are many mistakes. 1. "The author of this hymn did not allow any one to be a believer, even *in the lowest sense*, while he found the least stirring of sin." He did: but he took the word *born again* in too high a sense. 2. Yet "he supposes *the most advanced believers* are deeply sensible of their impurity." He does not: neither he nor I suppose any such thing. 3. "He tells us in his note on Eph. vi. 13, *The war is perpetual*." True: the war *with principalities and powers*; but not that *with flesh and blood*. 4. So you cannot reply, "Mr. W speaks of believers of different

stature." Indeed I can: and the forgetting this is the main cause of Mr. H.'s stumbling at every step. 5. "The position, that (any) believers are totally free from sin, is diametrically opposite to Calvinism." This is no mistake. Therefore most Calvinists hate it with a perfect hatred. 6. "Many of the grossest of these contradictions, were published nearly at the same time: and *probably* Mr. W was the same day correcting the press, both for and against Sinless Perfection." An ingenious thought! But as to the truth, or even *probability* of it, I cannot say much. 7. These hymns contain the joint sentiments of Mr. John and Mr. Charles Wesley." Not always: so that if *some* of them contradict others, it does not prove, that I contradict myself.

88. Christ in a *pure and sinless* heart.

There are still two contrary principles in believers, nature and grace. True, till they are perfect in love.

89. Quite expel the *carnal mind*.

That there is no sin in a (weak) believer, no *carnal mind*, is contrary to the word of God.

90. From *every evil motion* freed.

How naturally do men think, sin has *no motion*; therefore it has *no being*.

But how does this prove, that I contradict myself?

91. *All the struggle* then is o'er.

These are two of my brother's expressions, which I do not subscribe to.

92. I *wrestle not* now.

Let us watch and pray against the *enemy within*.

93. God is thine: disdain to fear the *enemy within*.

Are these lines cited as implying, the enemy *was not within*? Most unhappily. They mean, the enemy *which is within*. For the very next words, which Mr. H. himself cited but a page before, are,

God *shall* in thy flesh appear,
And make an end of sin.

94. We *wrestle not with flesh and blood*, when we are grown up in Christ.

We *wrestle both with flesh and blood*, and with principalities; while we are babes in Christ.

No contradiction yet.

Still he (the babe in Christ) feels the remains of the old man.

95. Sin *shall not in* our flesh remain.

Sin remains in them still. In all weak believers.

96. I cannot rest if *sin in me* remains.

97.

98. } My brother's.

99. }

100. "Do not the best of men say, *We groan, being burdened* with the workings of inbred corruption?" This is not the meaning of the text; the whole context

We groan, being burdened with numberless infirmities, temptations, and sins.—This is wrong. It is not the meaning of the text. I will put it out, if I live to print

shows, the cause of that groaning was, their longing to be with Christ.

101. Nor does he that is born of God sin by *infirmities*: for his infirmities have no concurrence of his will. And without this, they are *not properly sins*.—That is, they are not voluntary transgressions of a known law.

I see no contradiction here: but if there was, it ought not to have been mentioned. It could not by any generous writer; since Mr. Hill himself testifies, it was expunged before he mentioned it! But suppose it stood as at first, I flatly deny, that it is any contradiction at all. These infirmities may be in *some sense* sins; and yet not properly so: that is, sins in an improper, but not the *proper, sense* of the word.

13. But “Mr. W has not yet determined, whether *sins of surprise* bring the soul under condemnation or not. (p. 111.)” However, it were to be wished, that *sins of surprise and sins of infirmity* too were to be declared mortal at the next conference; since several persons who pretend to reverence Mr. W not only fall into *outrageous passions*, but cozen and over-reach their neighbours: and call these things *little, innocent infirmities*. Reader, weigh well those words of Mr. W ‘We cannot say, either that men are or are not condemned for sins of surprise.’ And yet immediately before he calls them, *transgressions*, as here he calls them sins. *Strange divinity* this, for one who for near forty years past has professed to believe and teach that sin is the transgression of the law, and that ‘the wages of sin is death.’” He then brings three instances of sins of surprise, (over and above *cozening and over-reaching*,) *drunkenness, fornication*, and flying into a *passion and knocking a man down*: and concludes, “Mr. W had better sleep quietly, than rise from his own pillow in order to lull his hearers asleep, upon the pillow of false security, by speaking in so light a manner of sin, and making the breach of God’s holy law a mere nothing.”

14. This is a charge indeed! And it is perfectly new: I believe it was never advanced before. It will not therefore be improper to give it a thorough examination. It is founded on some passages in the sermon on Rom. viii. 4. “There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” In order to give a clear view of the doctrine therein delivered, I must extract the sum of the sermon.

I show, 1. Who are “those that are in Christ Jesus:” “Those who are joined to the Lord in one spirit, who dwell in Christ and Christ in them. And ‘whosoever abideth in him sinneth not, walketh not after the flesh,’ that is, corrupt nature. These abstain from every design, and word, and work, to which the corruption of nature leads. (p. 145.) They ‘walk after the Spirit’ both in their hearts and lives. By him they are led into every holy desire, into every di-

another edition. So just one shot in a hundred has hit the mark.

Many infirmities remain, whereby we are daily subject to what are called *sins of infirmity*. And they are in some sense sins; as being (involuntary) transgressions of the perfect law.

vine and heavenly temper, till every thought of their heart is ‘holiness to the Lord.’

“They are also led by him into all holiness of conversation. They exercise themselves day and night, to do only the things which please God: in all their outward behaviour, to follow him ‘who left us an example that we might tread in his steps:’ in all their intercourse with their neighbour, to walk in justice, mercy, and truth: and whatsoever they do in every circumstance of life, to ‘do all to the glory of God.’” (p. 246.)

Is here any room for “cozening and over-reaching?” For “flying into outrageous passions?” Does this give any countenance, for “knocking men down?” For “drunkenness, or fornication?”

But let us go on to the second head. “To whom is there no condemnation? To believers in Christ who *thus walk after the Spirit*, there is no condemnation for their past sins. (p. 127.) Neither for present, for now transgressing the commandments of God: for they do not transgress them. *This is the proof of their love of God, that they keep his commandments.* (p. 148.) They are not condemned, 3. for inward sin, so long as they do not yield thereto; so long as they *maintain a continual war with all sin*, with pride, anger, desire, so that the flesh hath no dominion over them, but they still walk after the Spirit.” (p. 150.) Is any encouragement given here to cozeners or whoremongers?

It follows, “They are not condemned for sins of infirmity, as they are usually called. Perhaps it were advisable rather to call them *infirmities*, that we may not seem to give any countenance to sin, or to extenuate it in any degree, by thus coupling it with infirmity. But (if we must use such an *ambiguous and dangerous expression*) by *sins of infirmity* I would mean, such involuntary failings, as the saying a thing we believe true, though in fact it prove to be false; or the hurting our neighbour, without knowing or designing it; perhaps when we designed to do him good.” (p. 151.)

What pretence has Mr. H. from these words to flourish away upon my “*strange divinity?*” And to represent me giving men a handle, to term gross sins *innocent infirmities*?

But now comes the main point. “It is more difficult to determine concerning those which are usually styled *sins of surprise*. (p. 152.) As when one who commonly in his patience possesses his soul, on a sudden or violent temptation, speaks or acts in a manner not consistent with the royal law of love.” (For instance. You have the gout. A careless man treads on your foot. You violently push him away, and it may be cry out, “Get away: get you out of my sight.”) “Perhaps it is not easy, to fix a general rule concerning transgressions of this nature. We cannot say either that men are, or that they are not condemned, for *sins of surprise in general.*” (p. 153.)

“Reader,” says Mr. H. “let me beg of thee to weigh well the foregoing words.” I say so too. I go on. “But it seems, whenever a believer is overtaken in a fault; there is more or less condemnation, as there is more or less concurrence of his will.—Therefore some sins of surprise bring much guilt and condemnation. For in

some instances our being surprised may be owing to some culpable neglect, or to a sleepiness of soul, which might have been prevented or shaken off, before the temptation came. The falling even by surprise in such an instance exposes the sinner to condemnation, both from God and his own conscience.

“On the other hand, there may be sudden assaults, which he hardly could foresee, by which he may be borne down, suppose into a degree of anger, or thinking evil of another, with scarcely any concurrence of the will. Now in such a case the jealous God would undoubtedly show him, that he had done foolishly. He would be convinced of having swerved from the perfect law, and consequently *grieved* with a godly sorrow, and lovingly *ashamed* before God. Yet need he not come into condemnation. In the midst of that sorrow and shame, he can still say, “The Lord is my strength and my song: he is also become my salvation.” (p. 154.)

Now what can any impartial person think of Mr. H.’s eloquence on this head? What a representation he has given of my doctrine, with regard to infirmities and sins of surprise? Was ever any thing more unjust? Was ever any thing more cruel? Do I here “lull my readers asleep on the *pillow* of false security?” Do I “speak in a *light manner* of sin?” Or “make the breach of God’s holy law a *mere nothing*?” What excuse can be made for pouring out all this flood of calumny? Can any thing be termed “bearing false witness against our neighbour,” if this is not? Am I indeed a loose casuist? Do any of my writings give countenance to sin? Not so: God knows, Mr. Hill knows, Mr. Romaine (who corrected this tract) knows it well. So does Mr. Madan: yea, so do all who read what I write, unless they wilfully shut their eyes.

15. “Thus have I at length,” says Mr. H. “brought this extraordinary *farrago* to a conclusion. Not because I could not have found many more inconsistencies.” (p. 142.) Yes, another hundred, such as these. But see a group of them at once! “His extract from bishop Beveridge, is flatly contradicted in his edition of John Goodwin. Again, Goodwin is flatly contradicted, by his sermon on ‘The Lord our Righteousness.’ This sermon is contradicted in his ‘Preservative against unsettled Notions in Religion.’ This Preservative is itself contradicted, by his Abstract from Dr. Preston. This Abstract is itself contradicted by his edition of Baxter’s Aphorisms. And these are flatly contradicted, by his extract from bishop Beveridge. And this is again flatly contradicted by his own ‘Thoughts on imputed Righteousness.’ Thus the wheel runs round!” Thus Mr. H.’s head runs round, with more haste than good speed. (If this curious paragraph be not rather, as I suspect, supplied by another hand; even as Sternhold’s Psalms are now and then eked out by N. N. or William Wisdom.) He forgets, that generals prove nothing; and that he has sadly failed in his particular charges: just a hundred out of a hundred and one, having proved void. So that now I have full right to say, “Whence arises his charge of self-inconsistency and contradiction? Merely from

straining, winding to and fro, and distorting a few innocent words. For wherein have I contradicted myself, taking words in their unforced, natural construction, in any one respect, with regard to justification, since the year 1738?"

17. But Mr. H.'s head is so full of my self-inconsistency, that he still blunders on. "Mr. W's wavering disposition is not an affair of yesterday. Mr. Delamotte spake to him *on this head*, more than thirty years ago." (p. 143.) He never spake to me *on this head* at all. Ask him. He is still alive. "He has been tossed from one system to another, from the time of his ordination to the present moment." Nothing can be more false; as not only my Journals, but all my writings testify. "And he himself cannot but acknowledge, that both his friends and foes have accused him of his unsettled principles in religion." Here is artifice! Would any man living, who does not know the fact, suppose that a *gentleman* would face a man down in so peremptory a manner, unless the thing were absolutely true? And yet it is quite the reverse. "He himself cannot but acknowledge."—I acknowledge no such thing. My friends have oftener accused me of being too stiff in my opinions, than too flexible. My enemies have accused me of both; and of every thing besides. The truth is, from the year 1725, I saw more and more of the nature of inward religion, chiefly by reading the writings of Mr. Law, and a few other *mystic* writers. Yet I never was "in the way of *mysticism*" at all: this is another mistake. Although I did not clearly see, that we are *saved by faith*, till the year 1738; I then published the sermon on *Salvation by Faith*, every sentence of which I subscribe to now.

17. But he was "too scrupulous about using the word *condition*." (p. 143.) I was so, till I was convinced by Dr. Church, that it was a very innocent word, and one that none of the reformers, English or foreign, objected to. All this time I leaned towards *Calvinism*, though more in expression than sentiment. "And now he fairly gives up the necessity of a *clear belief* of justification by faith alone!" That is, I say, A man may be saved, who is not *clear* in his judgment concerning it. I do: I dare not "rank Mr. Law and' all his admirers, among the hosts of *Diabolonians*." Nay, more: "I have *proved*, that he makes man's righteousness the *procuring cause* of his acceptance with God, and his *salvation*, from *first to last*, to depend upon the *intrinsic merit* of his own *unassisted works*." (p. 144.) I think Mr. H. "is now got to his *ne plus ultra*:" unless he has a mind to *prove*, that Mr. W is a horse.

18. "I expect you will tell me, that I have exposed Mr. W particularly in the foregoing contrast. That Mr. W is exposed, I allow; but that I have exposed him, I deny." Who was it then? Why, "out of his own mouth all that I have brought against him proceeds."

Not so. All that I have written (except one sentence out of a hundred and one) is well consistent with itself, provided the words be taken in their plain, natural sense, and one part of them in con-

nection with the other. But whoever will use Mr. H.'s art of twisting and torturing words, may make them say any thing, and extract Pelagianism, Arianism, or any thing he pleases, out of any thing that can be spoken. By this art, he that cries out against Mr. F.'s art, has found, that is, created above a hundred contradictions in my works, and "could find abundance more." Ay, five hundred : under his forming hand, contradictions spring up as quick as mushrooms. And he that reads only (as is the manner of a thousand readers,) the running title at the top of each page,

For election.

Against election.

For sinless perfection.

Against sinless perfection.

For imputed righteousness.

Against imputed righteousness.

And so on, will readily say, "What a heap of contradictions, flat, palpable contradictions, is here !" Here ! Where ? "Why, at the top of every page." True ; and there lies the strength of the cause. The propositions themselves are plain enough, but neither Mr. H. nor any man living can prove them.

19. But if so, if all this laboured contrast be only the work of a creative imagination, what has Mr. Hill, the cat's-paw of a party, been doing all this time ? Has he not been abundantly *doing evil, that good might come*, that the dear decree of reprobation might stand ? Has he not been *saying all manner of evil falsely*, pouring out slander like water, a first, a second, a third time, against one that never willingly offended him ? And what recompense can he make (be his opinions right or wrong) for having so deeply injured me, without any regard either to mercy or truth ? If he (not myself) has indeed exposed me in so unjust and inhuman a manner, what amends can he make, as a Christian and a gentleman, to God, to me, or to the world ? Can he gather up the foul, poisonous water which he has so abundantly poured out ? If he still insists, he has done me no wrong, he has only *spoken the truth in love* ; if he is resolved at all hazards to fight it out, I will meet him on his own ground. Waiving all things else, I fix on this point, "Is that scurrilous hotch-potch, which he calls a *Farrago*, true or false ?" Will he defend or retract it ? A hundred and one propositions are produced as *mine*, which are affirmed to contradict other propositions of *mine*. Do I in these hundred and one instances, *contradict myself*, or do I not ? Observe : the question is, whether I *contradict myself* ? Not whether I contradict *some body else* : be it Mr. Baxter, Goodwin, Fletcher, the Christian Library, or even my own brother. These are not *myself*. "Nay, but you have published them." If I publish them ten times over, still they are not *myself*. I insist upon it, that no man's words but *my own* can ever prove, that *I contradict myself*. Now, if Mr. H. scorns to yield, let him fall to work, and prove by *my own* words, that *I contradict myself* (that is the present question,) in these hundred instances. If he can prove this, I am a blunderer ; I must plead guilty to the charge. If he cannot, he is one of the most cruel and inhuman slanderers, that ever set pen to paper.

20. I bless God, that the words cited from the sermon on a *Catholic Spirit*, do quite "come to myself:" not indeed as I am *painted* by Mr. H. but as I really am. From the year 1738, I have not been "unsettled as to any fundamental doctrine of the gospel." No, not in one: I am as clear of this charge, as of that wonderful one advanced in the note. (p. 146.) "Though this sermon be entitled *Catholic Spirit*, yet it inculcates an attendance upon one only congregation: in other words, hear *me*, and *those I send out*, and *no body else*." Mr. H. himself knows better: he knows I advise all of the church, to hear the parish minister. I do not advise, even dissenters of any kind, not to hear their own teachers. But I advise all, do not *heap to yourselves preachers, having itching ears*. Do not run hither and thither to hear every new thing; else you will be established in nothing. "However, it is by *stratagems* of this sort, that he holds so many souls in his *shackles*, and prevents them from coming to the knowledge of *all the glorious truths of the gospel*."

Observe, *Gospel* is with Mr. H. the same as *Calvinism*. So where he says "there is no *gospel*," he means no *predestination*. By the same figure of speech, some of his admirers used to say, "there is no *honey* in the book." Here lies the core: this is the wrong, for which the *bigots* of *this gospel* will never forgive me. And all those are such, who "rank all *election doubters* among *Diabolonians*." Such is Mr. H. a bigot in grain, while he sets his hand to that gentle sentence. Nay, further, says he, "I cannot help informing my readers," (no, if he did, he must burst,) "that in the life of Mr. Philip Henry, published in his *Christian Library*, he has artfully left out Mr. Henry's *Confession of Faith*." *Artfully!* No; *honestly*; according to the open profession in the preface cited before.

21. Yet Mr. H. this Mr. H. says to Mr. Fl. "Suffer not *bitter words* and *calumnious expressions* to disguise themselves under the appearance of plainness." (p. 147.) Bitter words! Can Mr. H. imagine there is any harm in these? Mr. H. that cites *the judicious* Mr. Toplady! That admires the famous *Eleven Letters*, which are *bitterness* double distilled! Which overflow with little else but *calumnious expressions*, from the beginning to the end! Mr. H. that himself wrote the *Review*, and the *Farrago*! And does he complain of Mr. Fletcher's bitterness? Why, *he* may be a little bitter; but not Mr. F. Altering the person alters the thing! "If it was *your* bull that gored *mine*, says the judge in the fable, that is another case!"

22. Two objections to my personal conduct, I have now briefly to consider. 1. "Mr. W embraced Mr. Shirley as a friend at the Conference, and then directly went out to give the signal for war." (p. 150.) This is partly true. It is true, that although I was not ignorant of his having deeply injured me, yet I freely forgave him at the Conference, and again "embraced him as a friend." But it is not true, that I "directly went out to give the signal for war." "Nay, why else did you consent to the publishing of Mr. F's letters?" Because I judged it would be an effectual means of undoing

the mischief which Mr. S. had done. Not that I am now sorry (though I was) for what he has done, for his publication of that bitter circular letter. For I now clearly discern the hand of God throughout that whole affair. Both my brother and I still indulged the fond hope of living in peace with our *warm Calvinist* brethren: but we now give it up: our eyes are open; we see what we have to expect. We look for neither mercy nor justice at their hands: if we find any, it will be clear gains.

23. The second objection is, "Mr. W. acknowledged the *unguarded* manner in which the Minutes were drawn up: and yet immediately after defended them." I answer, "How did I acknowledge the *unguarded* manner?" The plain case was this. I seek peace, and would do any thing for it, which I can with a safe conscience. On this principle it was, that when Mr. S. read over his declaration, (I say his, for it was he drew it up, not I,) and asked, if we agreed thereto? I was heartily desirous to agree with him as far as possible. In order to this, after altering some words, I asked our brethren if they were willing to sign it? One immediately said, "The Minutes are not *unguarded*; they are guarded enough." I said, They are guarded enough for *you*; but not for those who seek occasion against us. And observe, it is only in *this* sense that I subscribed to that expression. But I will not affirm, that my love of peace did not carry me a little too far. I know not but it would have been better, not to have signed the paper at all.

24. So much for the Minutes. Perhaps it may be expected, that I should also take some notice of what Mr. H. says concerning Perfection. All his arguments indeed, and ten times more, I have answered over and over. But if it is required, I will answer once more: only premising, By that *Perfection*, to which St. Paul directs Mr. H. and me to *go on*, Heb. vi. 1, I understand neither more nor less, than what St. John terms *perfect love*, 1 John iv. 18, and our Lord, "Loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and strength." If you choose to call this *sinful perfection*, (rather than *sinless*) you have my free leave.

Mr. H.'s main argument against this is, that "it is a *popish* doctrine." How does this appear? "O, Luther says so." (p. 25.) This will not do: it is only *second hand* evidence. "It crept into the church first in the fifth century, and has been since almost generally received in the church of Rome." (p. 49.) How is this proved? Either that the doctrine of *perfect love* crept first into the church in the fifth century? Or, that it has been since almost generally received in the church of Rome? Why, "we may very readily perceive this, by the following extract from Bishop Cowper." I answer, 1. This is but *second hand* evidence still. 2. It is wide of the mark. For this whole extract says not a word about the church of Rome. It contains only a few citations from St. Augustin and St. Bernard, foreign to the present question; and one from St. Ambrose, if it be possible, more foreign still. None of these touch either of the points in question, "This doctrine crept into the

church in the fifth century :" or, " It has been (ever) since almost generally received in the church of Rome."

Here I must beg leave to put Mr. H. in mind of one stated rule in controversy. We are to take no authorities at *second hand*, but always recur to the originals. Consequently, words of St. Bernard, or twenty saints more, *copied from Bishop Cowper*, prove just nothing. Before we can urge the authority of St. Bernard or Ambrose, we must consult the authors themselves, and tell our readers what edition we use, with the page where the words are found: otherwise they cannot form a judgment either of the fairness of the quotation, or of the sense and weight of it.

Hitherto then we have not one tittle of proof, that this is a *popish* doctrine; that it ever was, or is now, " almost generally received in the church of Rome :" (although if it had, this would be no conclusive argument against it: as neither is it conclusive against the doctrine of the blessed Trinity :) I do not know that it ever was: but this I know; it has been solemnly condemned by the church of Rome. It has been condemned by the Pope and his whole conclave, even in this present century. In the famous bull *Unigenitus*, (so called from the first words, *Unigenitus Dei filius*,) they utterly condemn the *uninterrupted act*, (of faith and love, which some then talked of, of continually *rejoicing, praying, and giving thanks*,) as *dreadful heresy*! Now in what public act of the church of Rome is the doctrine of Perfection maintained? Till this is produced, I pray let us hear no more that Perfection is a *popish* doctrine.

25. However, "the distinction between *sins* and innocent *infirmities* is derived from the Romish church." (p. 56.) How does this appear? Thus. "Two of her devoted champions, Lindenus and Andradius, distinguish between infirmities and sins." Lindenus and Andradius! Who are they? From what country did they come? I do not know the men. One of them, for aught I know, might serve as an interpreter at the council of Trent. What then? Was he an authorized interpreter of the doctrines of the church? Nay, and how do you know, that they did speak of *little trifling faults*, or of *minute and trivial sins*? Did you ever read them? Pray what edition of their works do you use? And in what page do these words occur? Till we know this, that there may be an opportunity of examining the books, (though I fear scarcely worth examining) it is doing too much honour to *such quotations*, to take any notice of them at all.

26. Well, now for the buskins! Now *spirat tragicum satis*! "And this is the doctrine which is preached to more than thirty thousand souls, of which Mr. W has the charge." Then I am sure that it is high time, that not only the Calvinist ministers, but "all that wish well to the interest of protestantism," (so Mr. S. said before,) "should *in a body protest* against such licentious tenets." *Blow ye the trumpet in Sion!* Gird on your armour! Make ye yourselves ready for battle! Again the trumpet sounds: a crusade! A holy war! Down with the heretics! But hold! what spirit are you of? Are you followers of peace? Then *bring forth your strong rea-*

sons: *speak the truth in love*, and we are ready to meet you. But really all this talk of *my* licentious doctrine, is a mere copy of Mr. H.'s countenance. *He* knows, and all in England know, (whoever have heard my name,) that it is not *too loose*, but *too strict* doctrine I am constantly accused of. Therefore all this bluster, about "my superseding the law," has not only no truth, but no colour, no plausibility. And when Mr. H. calls so gravely for Dr. Crisp, to "sweep away all my Antinomian rubbish," shall we laugh or weep?

Cuivis facilis rigidi censura cachinni.

Rather let us drop a tear on human infirmity.

27. So much for the first grand argument against perfection, That it is generally received in the church of Rome. The second is, "It was generally received among the ranting Anabaptists in Germany." (p. 49.) What author of note testifies this? I allow no *second hand* authority; but desire to know what German historian of credit has recorded it? And in what page of his works? When this is ascertained, then we may observe, it proves just nothing.

A third argument against perfection is, that "it was maintained by many wild ranters in London." Wild enough! Although no stress is to be laid on Mr. H.'s informations concerning them; some of which are altogether false, and the rest imperfect enough. But suppose they were all true, what would follow? Many hearers abusing the doctrines I teach, no more prove that those doctrines are false, than the German ranters proved that Luther's were so.

28. Is it another *argument*, that "the monstrous doctrine of perfection turns some of its deluded votaries into monsters!" (p. 44.) This may be proved from the cases of Bell and Harris; the former of whom prophesied, that the world would be at an end the last of February: the latter was seized with raging madness, and died blaspheming in a most dreadful manner."

It would be strange, if George Bell were not brought upon the stage, as he has been a hundred times over. As for poor Benjamin Harris, I believe, as a punishment for his pride and uncharitableness, God permitted him to be struck in an instant with diabolical madness. But it did not continue to his death; he did not die blaspheming. I saw him myself quiet and composed: and he calmly delivered up his soul to God.

See another instance. "A friend of mine lately informed me, that an eminent preacher of perfection told him, that he had not sinned for some years, and that the Holy Ghost had descended and sat on him and many others in a visible manner, as he did upon the apostles in the day of Pentecost." Please to name the man: otherwise a hundred such tales will weigh nothing with men of sense and candour.

Behold a fourth. "Last year I myself conversed with a gentlewoman of such high perfection, that she said no man could teach her any thing, and went to no place of worship for years together: however, she was a scold, and beat her maid." Perhaps so. And what

is that to me? If she is a member of our Society, tell me her name; and she will be in it no longer. This is our glorying. It must be that many members of our Society will from time to time grow weary of well-doing; yea, that some will fall into sin. But as soon as this appears, they have no more place among us. We regard no man's person, high or low, rich or poor. A disorderly walker cannot continue with us.

Again. "One told God in prayer, that she was perfect, as God himself was perfect." "Another prayed, Grant, O Lord, that all here present may be perfect as I am perfect." (p. 45.) Till you name the men, this too must go for nothing. But suppose it all true, what will it prove? Only that there are madmen in the world.

"I could also tell him of a woman, who was so perfect, that she tried to sin and could not." Pray name her.

"Mr. W must also well remember a certain perfect married lady, who was got with child by a perfect preacher." I do not remember any such thing. I never heard of it before.

29. But "I hate," says Mr. H. "the law of retaliation."—Truly one would not have thought it.—"And would not have mentioned these things, but that you set me the example," *i. e.* but by way of retaliation. "Should you doubt the truth of these instances, I will lead you to the fountain-head of my intelligence." That will not do. In order to *be even* with Mr. F. you have told seven shocking stories. Several of these I know to be false: I doubt if any, but that of George Bell, be true. And now you offer to "lead Mr. F. to the fountain-head of your intelligence!" Probably to one or two renegade Methodists, who court the world by slandering their brethren! "But Mr. W adopts this way." No, never. In my letter to Mr. Hervey, I occasionally name two famous men; but I do not slander them. In my journals I name several others. This is above board: but Mr. H. stabs in the dark. He gives us no names, no places of abode; but casts arrows and firebrands abroad. And let them light where they may, on guilty or guiltless: of that he takes no care.

30. It remains only, to consider the queries, which Mr. H. addresses directly to *me*.

1. "Did not you in administering the sacrament a few years ago, to a *perfect* society in West-street chapel, leave out the confession?"

Yes, and many times since. When I am straitened for time, (as I generally am there, on a Monday,) I begin the communion service at, "We do not presume to come to this thy table." On Monday Mr. Madan desired to stay. Here, I suppose, is "the fountain-head of this intelligence."

2. "Did not one of the enthusiasts then say, he had heard a voice telling him, *he was all holiness to the Lord?*"

Possibly so: but I remember nothing of it.

3. "Did not a second declare the same thing?"

Not that I remember.

4. "Did not George Bell say, he should never die?"

He often did, if not then.

5. "Did not one present confirm it?"

Not unlikely: but I do not remember it.

6. "Did not another perfect brother say, he believed the millennium was near: for there had been more constables sworn in that year than heretofore?"

Are you sure he was a *perfect brother*? *i. e.* one that professed so to be? As for me, I can say nothing about it. For I neither remember the man, nor the words.

"This I have put down verbatim from the mouth of a judicious friend then present; but from that time he has been heartily sick of *sinless perfection*." Say of *perfect love*.

Is it only *from that time* that Mr. Madan has been sick of it? Was he not sick of it before?

7. "Do not you know a clergyman, one closely connected with you, who refused a great witness for perfection the sacrament, because he had been detected in bed with a *perfect sister*?"

No. I never heard of it before. Surely Mr. M——d is not fallen so low as to *invent* such a tale as this!

I need not say any thing to your last anecdote, since you (for once!) "put a candid construction upon my words." If I did speak them, which I can neither affirm nor deny, undoubtedly my meaning was, (as yourself observe,) "Though I have been holding forth the imputed righteousness of Christ to a mixed congregation, yet I think it right to caution you of the society, how you abuse that doctrine, which to some, who turn it into licentiousness, is a smooth doctrine, of which you ought to beware." (p. 61.) But your friend, it seems, "who gave you this account," did not put so candid a construction on my words. You say, "he was so struck, as hardly to refrain from speaking to you in the chapel. And from that hour he gave up all connections with you." *i. e.* He sought a pretence; and he found one!

And now what does all this amount to? Several persons who professed high things, degenerated into pride and enthusiasm, and then talked like lunatics, about the time that they renounced connection with me, for mildly reproving them. And is this any objection against the existence of that love which they professed? Nay, and I verily believed once enjoyed, though they were afterward *moved from their steadfastness*. Surely no more than a justified person's running mad, is an objection against justification. Every doctrine must stand or fall by the Bible. If the perfection I teach agree with this, it will stand, in spite of all the enthusiasts in the world: if not, it cannot stand.

31. I now look back on a train of incidents that have occurred, for many months last past, and adore a wise and gracious Providence, ordering all things well! When the Circular Letter was first dispersed throughout Great Britain and Ireland, I did not conceive the immense good which God was about to bring out of that evil. But no sooner did Mr. Fletcher's first Letters appear, than the scene began to open. And the design of Providence opened more and

more, when Mr. S.'s narrative, and Mr. H.'s letters, constrained him to write and publish his Second and Third Check to Antinomianism. It was then indisputably clear, that neither my brother nor I had borne a sufficient testimony to the truth. For many years, from a well-meant but ill-judged tenderness, we had suffered the reprobation preachers, (vulgarly called *gospel-preachers!*) to spread their poison almost without opposition. But at length they have awakened us out of sleep: Mr. Hill has answered for all his brethren, roundly declaring, that "any agreement with election-doubters is a covenant with death." It is well: we are now fore-warned and fore-armed. We look for neither peace nor truce, with any who do not openly and expressly renounce this diabolical sentiment. But since God is on our side, we will not fear what man can do unto us. We never before saw our way clear, to do any more than act on the defensive. But since the Circular Letter has sounded the alarm, has called forth all their hosts to war; and since Mr. H. has answered the call, drawing the sword, and throwing away the scabbard: what remains, but to own the hand of God, and make a virtue of necessity? I will no more desire any *Arminian*, so called, to remain only on the defensive. Rather chase the fiend, Reprobation, to his own hell, and every doctrine connected with it. Let none pity or spare one limb of either speculative or practical Antinomianism: or of any doctrine that naturally tends thereto, however veiled under the specious name of *Free-Grace*. Only remembering, that however we are treated by men, who have a dispensation from the vulgar rules of justice and mercy, we are not to fight them at their own weapons, to return railing for railing. Those who plead the cause of the God of love, are to imitate him they serve: and however provoked, to use no other weapons than those of truth and love, of scripture and reason.

32. Having now answered the queries you proposed, suffer me, Sir, to propose one to you: the same which a gentleman of your own opinion proposed to me some years since. "Sir, how is it that as soon as a man comes to the knowledge of *the truth*, it spoils his temper?" That it does so I had observed over and over, as well as Mr. J. had. But how can we account for it? Has *the truth*, (so Mr. J. termed what many love to term *the doctrine of free-grace*,) a natural tendency to *spoil the temper*? To inspire pride, haughtiness, superciliousness? To make a man *wiser in his own eyes than seven men that can render a reason*? Does it naturally turn a man into a cynic a bear, a Toplady? Does it at once set him free from all the restraints of good-nature, decency, and good-manners? Cannot a man hold *distinguishing grace*, as it is called, but he must distinguish himself for passion, sourness, bitterness? Must a man as soon as he looks upon himself to be an absolute favourite of heaven, look upon all that oppose him as *Diabolonians*, as predestinated dogs of hell? Truly, the melancholy instance now before us, would almost induce us to think so. For who was of a more amiable temper than Mr. Hill, a few years ago? When I first conversed with him in London,

I thought I had seldom seen a man of fortune, who appeared to be of a more humble, modest, gentle, friendly disposition. And yet this same Mr. H. when he has once been grounded in the *knowledge of the truth*, is of a temper as totally different from this, as light is from darkness ! He is now haughty, supercilious, disdaining his opponents, as unworthy to be set with the dogs of his flock ! He is violent, impetuous, bitter of spirit ! In a word, the author of the *Review* !

O Sir, what a commendation is this of your doctrine ? Look at Mr. H. the *Arminian* ! The loving, amiable, generous, friendly man. Look at Mr. H. the *Calvinist* ! Is it the same person ? This spiteful, morose, touchy man ? Alas, what has the *knowledge of the truth* done ! What a deplorable change has it made ? Sir, I love you still ; though I cannot esteem you as I did once. Let me entreat you, if not for the honour of God, yet for the honour of your cause, avoid for the time to come, all anger, all spite, all sourness and bitterness, all contemptuous usage of your opponents, not inferior to you, unless in fortune. *O put on again bowels of mercies, kindness, gentleness, long-suffering ; endeavouring to hold, even with them that differ from you in opinion, the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace !*

BRISTOL, Sept. 9, 1772.

SOME REMARKS

ON

MR. HILL'S FARRAGO DOUBLE-DISTILLED.

“ If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.”
Rom. xii. 18.

1. IT is far from my design to give a particular answer to every thing contained in Mr. Hill's late treatise. I intend only to offer to the impartial reader, a few cursory remarks, which may partly explain and partly confirm what I have already said upon the subject.

2. “ Poor Mr. Wesley,”* says Mr. Hill, opening his cause with native eloquence, “ has published various tracts, out of which Mr. Hill collects above a hundred gross contradictions. At this Mr.

* Page 3. Quotations from Mr. Hill are marked with double, from the Remarks, with single commas.

W's temper is much ruffled ;" (I believe not ; I am not sensible of it;) "he primes, cocks, and fires at Calvinism : and there is smoke and fire in plenty. But if you can bear the stench, (which indeed is very nauseous) there is no danger of being wounded. (p. 4.) He calls this last cannon, or pop-gun, *Remarks on my Review*. Men of sense say, it is quite unfit for duty: men of grace compassionate the *caster* of it : men of pleasantry laugh heartily at it ; but some good old women speak highly of it." (p. 5.) I give this passage at some length, as a genuine specimen of Mr. Hill's manner of writing.

3. But "as Mr. Hill did not choose to prefix his name, *it argued no great proof of* Mr. W's *politeness*, to address him in the personal manner he has done." Which of us began? Was it not Mr. Hill? Did not he address me in a personal manner first? And some, beside the old women, are of opinion, he did not do it in the *politest* manner in the world.

4. "Mr. W would have us know, that his piece is written in *much love*. But what *love*? Love to his own inconsistencies ; love of scolding, love of abuse. Let the reader find out any other sort of love through the whole performance." In order to judge whether I wrote in love or not, let any one read the words he has picked out of fifty-four pages, just as they stand connected with others in each page : it will then appear they are not contrary either to love or meekness.

5. But Mr. W says, Mr. Hill "is unworthy the name either of the gentleman or the Christian: and is amazed, that Mr. Hill should lay claim to either of those titles." (p. 6.) Not so. It is my belief, that Mr. Hill is both a gentleman and a Christian : though I still think, in his treatment of Mr. Fletcher and me, he has acted beneath his character. Yet it is very likely, "a friend of yours, (not mine,) might say, I wrote in *much wrath*." (p. 7.) I wrote then in just as much wrath as I do now ; though your friend might think otherwise.

6. Nay, but Mr. W "gives all the Calvinist ministers the most scurrilous, Billingsgate language, while he is trumpeting forth his own praises, in Mr. F.'s Second Check to Antinomianism." (p. 8.) A small mistake. I do not give Billingsgate language to any one : I have not so learned Christ. Every one of those hymns out of which Mr. Hill culls the harshest expressions, are not mine, but my brother's. Neither do I "trumpet forth my own praises." Mr. Hill's imagining I do, arises from an innocent mistake. He continually takes for granted, that I read over and correct all Mr. F.'s books before they go to the press. So far from it, that the Fourth Check to Antinomianism I have not read over to this day. But Mr. W "thinks himself to be *the greatest minister in the world*." Exceedingly far from it. I know many now in England, at whose feet I desire to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus.

7. To that question, Why does a man 'fall upon me, because another gave him a good beating?' Mr. Hill answers, "If you

trumpet had not given the alarm, we should not have prepared ourselves for the battle." (p. 53.) Nay truly, not mine, but Mr. Shirley's. I was sitting quietly in my study, on the other side of St. George's channel, when his trumpet gave the alarm. Yet I say again, I am not now sorry for these disputes though I was sorry. You say, truly, "Mr. W's temper has been manifested" hereby. (p. 56.) Let all candid men judge between us, Whether Mr. F and I on the one hand, or Mr. Hill on the other, had shown more "meekness and lowliness?" And which of us has expressed the greatest heat, and the most cordial contempt of his opponent.

Mr. H. adds, "Hereby Mr. Charles Wesley's Calvinism is exposed by Mr. John." Then that is exposed, which never existed, for he never was a Calvinist yet. And "hereby Mr. H. says, the Christian Library is given up as nothing." Mere finesse! Every one sees my meaning, but those that will not see it. It is *nothing to your purpose*: it *proves nothing of what it is brought to prove*. In the same sense I set the word nothing over against the citations from Mr. Baxter and Goodwin.

8. If Mr. Hill says, he *always was* a Calvinist, I have no right to contradict him. But I am sure he was of a widely different temper, from that he has shown in his late writings. I allow much to his belief, that in exposing me to the utmost of his power, he is doing God service. Yet I must needs say, if I were writing against a Turk or a Pagan, I durst not use him as Mr. Hill does me. And if I really am, (which will one day appear,) employing all my time, and labour, and talents, (such as they are) for this single end, that the kingdom of Christ may be set up on earth: then he whom I serve in the gospel of his Son, will not command him for his present work.

9. But what makes Mr. Hill so warm against me? I still believe it is for this chiefly, because I am an Arminian, an Election-doubter. For, says he, the "good old preacher, places all election-doubters, (that is, those who are not clear in the belief of Absolute Predestination,) among the numerous hosts of the Diabolonians. One of these being brought before the judge, the judge tells him he must die." (p. 35.) That is plainly, he must die eternally for this damnable sin. I beg Mr. Hill to explain himself on this head. Does he still subscribe to the sentence of this good *old preacher*? Are all election-doubters to be placed among the Diabolonians? Is the sentence irreversibly passed, That they must all die eternally? I must insist on Mr. Hill's answering this question: if not, silence gives consent.

10. Mr. H. farther affirms, "The only cement of Christian union is the love of God. And the foundation of that love must be laid, in believing *the truths of God*:" that is, you *must believe* particular redemption, or it is impossible you should love God. For, to use "the words of Dr. Owen in his display of Arminianism," (see what truths Mr. Hill means!) "an agreement without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ."

(p. 93.) Here again I beg an explicit answer. Will Mr. H. affirm this in cool blood? If he will, there needs no more to account for his enmity both to me and the Minutes. "Nay but the foundation is struck at by those wretched Minutes." (p. 52.) True, the foundation of Calvinism. So I observed before; I know it well. If the Minutes stand, Calvinism falls. But Mr. Hill says, "The doctrines of election and perseverance are very little, indeed scarcely at all dwelled on in the Review." Now I think they are very much dwelt on therein, and desire any that have eyes to judge.

11. We come now to the main question, Is the *Farrago* true or false? I aver it to be totally false: except in one single article out of a hundred and one. I mean Mr. Hill has not proved that I contradict myself except in that single instance. To come to particulars.

I.

"1. There was an *everlasting covenant* between the Father and Son, concerning man's redemption. (There never was such a co-rentant.)"

The former proposition is taken from the Christian Library: on which Mr. Hill says again, "Mr. W affirms, that the Christian Library is *all true, all agreeable to the word of God.*" I answered before, 'I do not.' (Rem. p. 12.) My words are, (Pref. p. 4,) 'I have endeavoured to extract such a collection of English divinity, as *I believe*, is all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God.' I did *believe*, and do *believe*, *every tract* therein to be true, and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this '*of every sentence* contained in the fifty volumes. I could not possibly affirm it, for two reasons, 1. I was obliged to prepare most of those tracts for the press just as I could snatch time in travelling; not transcribing them; (none expected it of me,) but only marking the lines with my pen, and altering a few words here and there, as I had mentioned in the preface. 2. As it was not in my power to attend the press, that care necessarily devolved on others; through whose inattention a hundred passages were left in, which I had scratched out. It is probable too, that I myself might overlook some sentences, which were not suitable to my own principles. It is certain, the correctors of the press did this, in not a few instances. The plain inference is, if there are a hundred passages in the Christian Library, which contradict any or all of my doctrines, these are no proofs that I contradict myself. Be it observed once for all, therefore, citations from the Christian Library, prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors.'

12. Yet Mr. Hill, as if he had never seen a word of this, or had solidly refuted it, gravely tells us again "If Mr. W may be credited, the *Farrago* is all true: part of it being taken out of *his own* Christian Library, in the preface of which he tells us, that the contents are *all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God.* Therefore *every single word* of it is *his own*, either by birth or adoption." (p. 12.) No. I never adopted, I could not adopt *every single word* of the

Christian Library. It was impossible I should have such a thought, for the reasons above mentioned.

But "there is very great evasion," (p. 16.) says Mr. Hill, "in Mr. W.'s saying, that though he believes *every tract to be true*, yet he will not be answerable for *every sentence or expression* in the Christian Library: whereas the matter by no means rests upon a few sentences or expressions, but upon *whole treatises*, which are diametrically opposite to Mr. W.'s present tenets; particularly the treatises of Dr. Sibs, Dr. Preston, Bishop Beveridge, and Dr. Owen, on *Indwelling Sin*."

13. Just before Mr. H. affirmed, "*Every single word* in the Christian Library is *his own*." Beaten out of this hold, he retreats to another: but it is as untenable as the former. "The matter," he says, "does not rest on a *few sentences*: *whole treatises* are diametrically opposite "to his present tenets." He instances in the works of Dr. Sibs, Preston, Beveridge, and a treatise of Dr. Owen's.

I join issue with him on this point. Here I pin him down. The works of Dr. Preston and Sibs, are in the ninth and tenth volumes of the Library: that treatise of Dr. Owen's in the seventeenth; that of Bishop Beveridge in the forty-seventh. Take which of them you please: suppose the last, Bishop Beveridge's *Thoughts upon Religion*. Is this *whole treatise* "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" The *Resolutions* take up the greatest part of the book; every sentence of which exactly agrees with my present judgment; so do at least nine parts in ten of the preceding *Thoughts*, on which those *Resolutions* are formed. Now what could possibly induce a person of Mr. Hill's character, a man of a good understanding and of a generous temper, a well-bred gentleman and a serious Christian, to violate all the rules of justice and truth, which at other times he so earnestly defends, by positively, deliberately, roundly asserting so entire a falsehood, merely to blacken one who loves his person, who esteems his character, and is ready to serve him in any thing within his power! What but so violent an attachment to his opinion, as while that is in danger, suspends all his faculties, so that he neither can *feel*, nor *think*, nor *speak* like himself?

14. In the ninth and tenth volumes are two treatises of Dr. Preston's, *The Breastplate of Faith and Love*, and *The New Covenant*. Is either of these "diametrically opposite to my present tenets." By no means. If a *few sentences* here and there (and this I only suppose, not grant) were carelessly left in, though I had scratched them out, which seem (perhaps only seem) to contradict them; these are not the *whole tracts*: the general tenor of which I still heartily subscribe to.

The tenth volume likewise contains *Two sermons* of Dr. Sibs, and his *Tract upon Solomon's Song*. Are any of these "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" No more than those of Dr. Preston's. I as willingly as ever subscribe to these also.

Is Dr. Owen's tract, *Of the Remainder of Indwelling Sin in Believers*, "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" So far from it,

that a few years since, I published a sermon on the very same subject. I hope there is no room to charge me with "quirk, quibble, artifice, evasion," on this head; (though I believe as much as on any other.) I use only plain, manly reasoning; and such logic I am not ashamed to avow before the whole learned world.

15. But "I will go farther still," says Mr. Hill. "Let Mr. W only bring me twenty lines together, out of the writings of those four eminent divines, as they stand in the Christian Library: and I will engage to prove, that he has twenty times contradicted them in some of his other publications." (p. 19.) Agreed. I bring him the following twenty lines with which Dr. Preston begins his treatise called *The New Covenant*. (Vol. X. p. 47.)

These words of God to Abraham contain a precept of sincerity, or perfect walking with God, "Walk before me, and be thou perfect;" and also the motive thereunto, God's all-sufficiency, "I am God all-sufficient." As if he should say, if there were any defect in me, if thou didst need or couldst desire any thing that were not to be had in me, and thou mightest have it elsewhere, perhaps thy heart might be imperfect in walking towards me. Thou mightest then step out from me, to take in advantages elsewhere. But seeing I am all-sufficient; since I have enough in me to fulfil all thy desires; since I am every way an adequate object, so that all thy soul can wish for, thou mayest have in me; why then shouldst thou not consecrate thyself to me alone? Why then shouldst thou be uneven in thy ways, serving me sometimes, and sometimes the creature? For there is nothing in the creature, but thou mayest find in me. "I am all-sufficient: therefore walk before me, and be thou perfect!"

Here are exactly twenty lines, neither more nor less, "as they stand in the Christian Library." Now fulfil your engagement; prove that I "have twenty times contradicted them in some other of my publications." If you cannot, acknowledge you have done me wrong. In the heat of your resentment, you have undertaken what you are not able to perform. You have spoken rashly and unadvisedly. You have gone much too far, far beyond the bounds of wisdom as well as of love.

16. Nay, but "I will go one step farther yet, I defy Mr. W to bring me twenty lines out of the above tracts, by Preston, Sibs, Owen, and Beveridge, which he now believes." Is it possible, that Mr. H. should believe himself, while he is talking at this rate? Or does he expect that any one else should believe him, unless he be drunk with passion or prejudice? Was ever any thing so wild? But I accept of this challenge, and that with more seriousness than it deserves. I will go no farther than the twenty lines cited above: all these I "now believe." And I believe, as I said before, not only the whole treatise from which those words are taken, but the tenor of the whole Christian Library.

Mean time it has been acknowledged again and again, that *several sentences* stand therein, which I had put out in my usual manner, by drawing my pen through them. Be it observed therefore once more,

that those passages prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors; consequently all the pains bestowed to collect them together, whether by Mr. Hill or his coadjutors, is absolutely lost labour, and never can prove that I contradict myself.

17. The case is nearly the same with regard to those other tracts which I published many years ago, Mr. *Baxter's aphorisms on justification, and John Goodwin's tract* on the subject. I have lately read them both over with all the attention I am capable of: and I still believe they contain the true scripture-doctrine concerning justification by faith: but it does not follow, that I am accountable for every sentence contained in either of those treatises.

“ But does Mr. W believe the doctrine therein contained, or does he not ? ” I do ; and John Goodwin believed the doctrine contained in the sermon on “ The Lord our Righteousness : ” the sum of which is, ‘ We are justified, sanctified, and glorified, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered for us.’ Nothing he asserts is inconsistent with this, though it may be inconsistent with passages left in the Christian Library: when therefore I write *nothing* against those passages, or the extracts from Goodwin, that contradict them, this does not prove (as Mr. Hill archly says) that “ I have nothing to say,” but that all those passages and extracts put together are nothing to the purpose. For were it true that John Goodwin and Richard Baxter contradicted all those passages, it is nothing to the point in hand ; it never can prove, that I, John Wesley, contradict myself.

18. But to return to the *Everlasting Covenant*. “ Mr. W himself, in his annotations on Gen. i. 1, calls the *Elohim* a *covenant God*. ” True, in covenant with man. But I say not one word of any covenant between the Father and the Son. But “ in his note on Isa. iv. 4, speaking of the covenant made between God and David, he says ‘ This David is Christ.’ Undoubtedly I do : but what is this brought to prove ? My words are, “ I have appointed, and will in due time give *him*—the David last mentioned, even Christ—a *witness*—to declare the will of God concerning the duty and salvation of men, to bear witness to the truth, to confirm God’s promises, and among others, those which respect the calling of the Gentiles : to be a witness to both parties of that covenant made *between God and man*. ” (p. 209.) Yea, of the covenant made *between God and man* ! Of a covenant *between the Father and the Son* here is not a word.

“ The only possible conclusion to be drawn from this defence of Mr. W ’s is, That he became a commentator on the Bible, before he could read the Bible.” That is pity ! If he could not read it when he was three-score years old, I doubt he never will. See the candour, the good-nature of Mr. Hill ! Is this *Attic* salt, or wormwood ?

What conclusion can be possibly drawn in favour of Mr. Hill ? The most favourable I can draw is this, That he never read the book which he quotes : that he took the word of some of his friends. But how shall we excuse them ? I hope they trusted their memories, not their eyes. But what recompense can he make to *me*, for publishing

so gross a falsehood; which nevertheless those who read *his* tract, and not mine, will take to be as true as the gospel?

II.

O Election and Perseverance.

19. In entering upon this head, I observed, 'Mr. Sellon has clearly shown, that the seventeenth article does not assert absolute predestination. Therefore in denying this, I neither contradict that article nor myself.' (p. 13.)

It lies therefore upon Mr. Hill, to answer Mr. Sellon before he witticizes upon *me*. Let him do this, and he talks to the purpose: otherwise all the pretty, lively things he says about Dr. Baroe, Bishop Wilkins, Dr. Clark, and George Bell, are utterly thrown away.

As to George Bell, Mr. Richard says, M. M——d "justly censures the *enthusiasm* and *credulity* of Mr. John, in paying so *much attention* to Bell's ridiculous reveries; in calling him a *sensible* man, and *entreating* him to continue in his society, on account of the great good he did. However, Bell *refused* to remain in connexion with him, because of his *double dealings* and *unfaithful proceedings*: for he sometimes was full of Bell's praises; at other times he would warn the people against him. He also gives a particular narration of what he rightly calls the *comet-enthusiasm*. Mr. John preached *more than ten times* about the comet which he *supposed* was to appear in 1758, to burn up all the producee of the earth, and lastly to execute its grand commission on the globe itself, causing the stars to fall from heaven." (p. 37.)

What a heap of dirt is here raked together! I must not let it pass quite unnoticed. 1. He "justly censures the *enthusiasm* and *credulity* of Mr. W in paying so *much attention* to Bell's ridiculous reveries." Nay, so very little, that I checked them strongly, as soon as ever they came to my knowledge: particularly his whim about the end of the world, which I earnestly opposed both in private and public. 2. "Bragging of the *many miraculous* cures he had wrought." I *bragged of*, that is, simply related the case of Mary Special, and no other: in the close of which I said, 'here are three plain facts, she was ill; she is well; she became so in a moment. Which of these can, with any modesty, be denied?' I still ask the same question. 3. That I ever called him a *sensible* man, is altogether false. A man of faith and love I then *knew* him to be; but I never thought him a man of sense. 4. That I *entreathed* him to continue in the society, is likewise totally false. 5. Nor did I ever tell *him* on that or any other occasion, of "the great good" he did. I know, he was an instrument in God's hand, of convincing and converting many sinners. But though I speak this now to all the world, I never spoke it to himself. 6. Neither did he ever *refuse* what never was asked, "*I*, remain in connexion with me." 7. Least of all did he refuse it because of my *double dealings* or *unfaithful proceedings*. He never mentioned to me any such thing, nor had he any pretence so to do. 8. Nay, but you "were at some times full of Bell's praises"—Very moderately full:—"At other times"—tha-

is, after he ran mad—"you warned the people against him." I warned them not to regard his prophecies; particularly with regard to the 28th of February. (Journal X. p. 99.)

20. "He also gives us a particular narration of what he rightly calls the *comet-enthusiasm*. Mr. John preached *more than ten times about the comet* he supposed was to appear in 1758, and to consume the globe." This is a foolish slander, as it is so easily confuted. A tract was published at that very time, entitled, "Serious Thoughts occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon." The thing which I then accidentally mentioned in preaching, (twice or thrice; it may be, four times,) is there set down at large, much more at large than ever I mentioned it in any sermon. The words are these.

"Dr. Halley fixes the return of the comet, which appeared in 1682, in the year 1758." (Observe, Dr. Halley does this, not I.) On which he adds, "But may the great, good God avert such a shock or contact of such great bodies, moving with such forces, (which however is by no means impossible,) lest this most beautiful order of things be entirely destroyed, and reduced into its ancient chaos." (p. 14, &c.)

'But what if God should not avert this contact? what would the consequence be?—That consequence I afterwards describe.—' Burning up all the produce of the earth, and then the globe itself.' But do I affirm or *suppose*, that it *actually will* do this? I suppose, nay, affirm, at the bottom of the same page, the direct contrary: 'What security is there against all this, on the *infidel* hypothesis? But on the Christian there is *abundant security*: for the prophecies are not yet fulfilled.'

21. So much for the *comet-enthusiasm*. We return now to the point of *unconditional election*. "One would imagine," says Mr. Hill, "by Mr. W's quoting the 31st Article, in *contradiction* to the 17th, that he thought the Reformers as inconsistent as himself." I did not quote the 31st in *contradiction* to the 17th, but in *explication* of it. The latter, the 31st, can bear but one meaning: therefore it fixes the sense of the former. "Nay, this article speaks nothing of the *extent* of Christ's death, but of its *all-sufficiency*." (p. 54). Nothing of the extent! Why, it speaks of nothing else: its all-sufficiency is out of the question. The words are, "The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." It is here affirmed, the death of Christ is a perfect satisfaction, for *all the sins of the whole world*. It *would be* sufficient for a thousand worlds. But of this the article says nothing.

But "even Bishop Burnet allows our Reformers to have been zealous Calvinists." He does not allow them *all* to be such: he knew and you know the contrary. You cannot but know, that Bishop Ridley, Hooper, and Latimer, to name no more, were firm Universalists.

22. But the contradictions! Where are the contradictions? "Why, sometimes you deny election: yet another time you say,

"From all eternity with love
Unchangeable thou hast me view'd." (p. 21.)

I answered, 'I believe this is true, on the supposition of *faith foreseen*, not otherwise.'

Here is therefore no contradiction, unless on that supposition, which I do not allow.

But sometimes "you deny the perseverance of the saints." Yet in one place you say, 'I do not deny, that those eminently styled the *elect shall persevere.*' I mean those that are *perfected in love.* So I was inclined to think for many years. But for ten or twelve years I have been fully convinced, that even these may *make shipwreck of the faith.*

23. But "several of Mr. Hill's quotations are from Mr. Charles Wesley's hymns, for which Mr. John says, he will not be answerable."

I will now explain myself on this head. 1. Though there are some expressions in my brother's hymns, which I do not use, as being very liable to be misconstrued: yet I am fully satisfied, that in the whole tenor of them, they thoroughly agree with mine, and with the Bible: 2. That there is no jot of Calvinism therein; that not one hymn, not one verse of a hymn, maintains either unconditional election, or infallible perseverance. Therefore I can readily answer Mr. H.'s question, "How can Mr. W answer it to his own conscience, to write prefaces and recommendations to hymns which he does not believe?" There is the mistake. I do believe them: although still I will not be answerable for *every expression* which may occur therein. But as to those expressions which you quote, in proof of final perseverance, they prove thus much, and no more, that the persons who use them have at that time *the full assurance of hope.* Hitherto then Mr. Hill has brought no proof that I contradict myself.

III.

Of Imputed Righteousness. (p. 23.)

24. "Blessed be God, we are not among those who are so *dark* in their conceptions and expressions. We no more deny, (says Mr. W.) the *phrase of imputed righteousness*, than *the thing.*" It is true: for I continually affirm, To them that believe, *faith is imputed for righteousness.* And I do not contradict this, in still denying that *phrase*, the *imputed righteousness of Christ*, to be in the Bible; or in beseeching both Mr. Hervey and you, 'not to dispute for *that particular phrase.*'

But "since Mr. W blesses God for enlightening him to receive the doctrine, and to adopt the phrase of imputed righteousness; how came he to think that *clear conceptions* of the doctrine were so unnecessary, and the phrase itself so useless, after having so *deeply lamented the dark conceptions* of those who rejected the term and the thing?"

It was neither this *term*, *The imputed righteousness of Christ*, nor the *thing*, which Antinomians mean thereby, the rejection of which I sup-

posed to argue any *darkness of conception*. But those I think *dark* in their conceptions, who reject either the *Scripture-phrase, faith imputed for righteousness*, or the *thing* it means.

25. However, to prove his point, Mr. Hill goes on :

“ This doctrine (of the imputed righteousness of Christ) I have constantly believed and taught for near eight and twenty years.”

The use of the term (the imputed righteousness of Christ) is not scriptural, it is not necessary ; it has done immense hurt.

“ It has done immense hurt, says Mr. W but here is no contradiction. Whether there be or not, there is a plain concession from Mr. W himself, that he has been *preaching a doctrine for eight and twenty years together, which has done immense hurt.*”

Let this (one instance out of a hundred) be a specimen of Mr. Hill’s fairness! The whole strength of the argument depends on the artful jumbling of two sentences together, and inserting two or three little words into the latter of them.

My words are, ‘We no more deny the *phrase* (of imputed righteousness) than the *thing*.’ (p. 14.)

‘ *This doctrine I have believed and taught for near eight and twenty years.*’ (p. 15.)

These distinct sentences Mr. Hill is pleased to thrust together into one, and to mend thus :

“ *This doctrine (of the imputed righteousness of Christ) I have constantly believed and taught for near eight and twenty years.*”

And here, says Mr. H. is a “ plain concession from Mr. W himself, that he has been preaching a doctrine for twenty-eight years together, which has done immense hurt.”

No, the doctrine which I believe has done immense hurt, is that of the imputed righteousness of Christ in the Antinomian sense. The doctrine which I have constantly held and preached is, that faith is, imputed for righteousness.

And when I have either in that sermon or elsewhere said, that *the righteousness of Christ is imputed to every believer*, I mean, every believer is justified for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered. Yet still I think, “ There is no use in contending for *that particular phrase.*” And I say still, ‘ I dare not insist upon it, because I cannot find it in the Bible.’

To contradict this, Mr. H. cites these words, ‘ This is fully consistent with our being justified, through the imputation of Christ’s righteousness.’ Mr. W’s notes on Rom. iv. 9. Mr. H. adds, “ These two taken together, produce the following conclusion, that it is *perfectly consistent* to say, that we are justified by that, *which cannot be found in the Bible.*” (p. 24.)

That note runs thus : ‘ *Faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness.* This is fully consistent with our being justified through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ : that is, our being pardoned and accepted of God, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered. For though this, and this alone, be the *meritorious cause*

of our acceptance with God, yet faith may be said to be *imputed to us for righteousness*, as it is the sole *condition* of our acceptance?

Now is there any shadow of contradiction in this? Or of our being justified *by that which cannot be found in the Bible*?

26. "Mr. W frequently puts the expression *imputed righteousness*, in the mouth of a whole congregation." Yet he says, 'I dare not *require* any to use it.' Hence Mr. Hill deduces these two conclusions :

1. "That Mr. W gives out such doctrines, as *he dares not require any others to believe.*" (p. 25.)

By what logic is this deduced? We are not speaking of *doctrines* at all, but simply of a particular *expression*. And that expression is not, *imputed righteousness*; but the *imputed righteousness of Christ*.

2. "That a whole congregation may have words in their mouths, and yet be *all silent.*"

Well inferred again! But did I say, "A whole congregation had *those words* in their mouths?" I did not either say or suppose it; any more than that they were *all silent*.

"Will Mr. W be ingenuous enough to tell me, Whether he did not write this, when he was last in a certain country, which abounds with *crassa ingenia*?" I will: I did not write this in the fogs of Ireland, but in the clear air of Yorkshire.

27. The two next propositions Mr. Hill quotes, are, 'They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed,' (I mean, who truly believe,) 'are made righteous by the Spirit of Christ, are renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.'

'The nice, metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteousness,' (if it is not carefully guarded,) 'leads not to repentance, but to licentiousness. I have known a thousand instances of this.'

And where is the contradiction between these propositions? "It is just this," says Mr. Hill, "That the doctrine of imputed righteousness makes those who believe it both holy and unholy." (p. 26.)

Unfold the propositions a little more, and then let any man judge.

The first means just this, They whom God justifies, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered, (whether they ever heard of that phrase, imputing the righteousness of Christ, or not,) are sanctified by his Spirit; are renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.

The second means, I have known very many, who so rested in the doctrine of the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, that they were quite satisfied without any holiness at all.

Now where is the contradiction?

But my inserting in my own sentence those explanatory words, 'I mean, who truly believe,' Mr. H. calls an *interpolation*, and supposes I "mean to make a distinction between faith in Christ, and faith in the righteousness of Christ." I mean just what I have said again and again, particularly in the note above cited. And this is the very thing which John Goodwin means, as he declares over and over.

Mr. W "winds up this point of *imputed righteousness* with a reso-

lution which astonishes me, That ‘ he will never more use the phrase *the imputed righteousness of Christ*, unless it occur to him in a hymn, or steal upon him unawares.’” This is my resolution. I repeat once more, what I said in the Remarks, ‘ The *thing*, that we are justified merely for the sake of what Christ has *done and suffered*, I have constantly and earnestly maintained, above four and thirty years. And I have frequently used the *phrase*, hoping thereby to *please others, for their good to edification*. But it has had a contrary effect, since so many improve it into an objection. Therefore I will use it no more,’ (I mean the phrase *Imputed Righteousness*: that phrase, the *Imputed Righteousness of Christ*, I never did use.) ‘ I will endeavour to use only such phrases as are *strictly scriptural*. And I will advise all my brethren, all who are in connexion with me throughout the three kingdoms, to lay aside that ambiguous, unscriptural phrase,’ (*the imputed righteousness of Christ*,) ‘ which is so liable to be misinterpreted, and speak in all instances, this in particular, *as the oracles of God*.’

IV

Of a Two-fold Justification. (p. 37.)

My words cited as contradicting this, run thus:—

28. ‘ In the afternoon I was informed, how many wise and learned men, who cannot in terms *deny* it, (because our articles and homilies are not yet repealed) *explain* justification by faith. (p. 38.) They say justification is two-fold, the first in this life, the second at the last day, &c.—In opposition to this, I maintain, That *the justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles*, is not two-fold: it is one and no more.’ True. And where do I contradict this? Where do I say, *the justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans and in our articles*, is any more than one? The question between them and me concerned *this* justification, and *this* only, which I affirmed to be but one. They averred, but there is a second justification at the last day: therefore justification is not one only. Without entering into that question I replied, ‘ *The justification whereof St. Paul and our Articles speak, is one only.*’ And so I say still. And yet I do not deny, that there is another justification (of which our Lord speaks) at the last day.

I do not therefore condemn the distinction of a two-fold justification, in saying, that *spoken of in our Articles* is but one. And this is the thing which I affirmed, “in flat opposition to those men.”

29. But “ how is it possible to encounter such a man as this, without watching him through every line? And therefore I wish my readers would closely compare the Remarks with the Review itself:” (I desire no more. Whoever does this, will easily discern on which side the truth lies:) “ As it is impracticable to point out half the *little arts* of this kind which Mr. W has stooped to.” That is, in civil terms, “ Sir, you are a knave.” Sir, I crave your mercy. I stoop to no art, but that of plain sound reasoning. By this art, and by this alone, I am able to untwist truth from falsehood, how skilfully soever they are woven together. I dare use no other; for (whether you know it or not) I fear God. And by his grace, in simplicity and godly sincerity, I have my conversation in the world.

“ But how agrees this with what Mr. W tells us, that he has never contradicted himself with regard to justification, since the year 1738 ? ” (p. 39.) Perfectly well. “ How long has he held, that justification is *four-fold* ? ” I have said nothing about it yet. “ And how will he reconcile this with its being two-fold, and with his preceding affirmation, that it is *one and no more* ? ” When time is, this mystery too may be cleared up.

V

Of a Justified State. (p. 34.)

30. Mr. W says, “ The state of a *justified* person is inexpressibly great and glorious.”

Yet he asks elsewhere, “ Does not talking of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men ? ” He answers, ‘ It *frequently* does mislead men,’ (namely, when it is spoken of in an *unguarded manner*,) ‘ But where is the contradiction ? ’ “ Whatever may be the contradiction, this is clearly the conclusion, that Mr. W by his own confession, *is a misleader of men*.”

It is not quite clear yet. You have first to prove, that I use the phrase ‘ in an *unguarded manner*. ’ I confess, when it is so used, it tends to mislead men ; but I do not confess, that I use it so.

VI.

Are Works a Condition of Justification.

31. “ Mr. W. says, ‘ No *good works* can be previous to justification.’ And yet in the same page he asserts, ‘ Whoever desires to find favour with God, should cease from evil, and learn to do well.’ ”

I answered, ‘ Does not the Bible say so ? Who can deny it ? Nay, but Mr. W asks, If this be not in order to find favour, what does he do them for ? And I ask it again. Let Mr. Hill, or any one else, give me an answer. So if there is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul.’

Remarks, p. 22.)

Mr. Hill replies, “ Then a man may do works in order to find favour, and yet such works cannot be called *good*.” You may call them so, if you please : but be not angry with me, if I do not. I still believe, no *good works* can be done before justification. Yet I believe (and that without the least self-contradiction,) that final salvation, is ‘ by works as a condition.’ And let any one read over the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, and deny it if he can.

VII.

*Is Justification by Faith *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ* ? (p. 15.)*

32. In the beginning of the year 1738, I believed it was so. Soon after, I found reason to doubt. Since that time I have not varied. “ Nay, but in the year 1763, you say, ‘ This is the name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our Righteousness*. A truth this, of which may be affirmed, (what Luther affirms of a truth nearly connected with it, justification by faith,) it is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*. It is certainly the pillar and ground of that faith of which alone cometh salvation.’ ”

I answered, ‘It is certain, here is a *seeming* contradiction; but it is not a real one: for these two opposite propositions do not speak of the *same thing*. The latter speaks of *justification by faith*: the former, of *trusting in the righteousness* or merits of *Christ*. (Justification by faith is only mentioned incidentally in a parenthesis.) Now although Mr. Law denied *justification by faith*, he might *trust in the merits of Christ*. It is this, and this only that I affirm, (whatever Luther does,) to be ‘*Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*.’ (Rem. p. 24.)

But Mr. Hill thinks “Justification by faith, and by trusting in the merits of Christ, are all one.” (p. 16.) Be they or not, I still think, ‘Some may doubt of justification by faith, and yet not perish everlastinglly.’ Does Mr. Hill judge, that such an one cannot be saved? That all Mystics, (as well as Mr. Law,) go to hell?

VIII.

Both Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness are imputed.

They are; the question is only, in what sense?

IX.

Of MERIT (p. 35.)

33. In the Minutes I say; ‘We are rewarded *according to our works*, yea, *because of* our works. (Gen. xxii. 16, 17.) How differs this from *for the sake of* our works? And how differs this from *secundum merita operum*, or as our works deserve? Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot.’ I say so still. Let Mr. Hill, if he can.

‘And yet I still maintain,’ (so I added in the Remarks: so I firmly believe) ‘there is no *merit*, taking the word strictly, but in the Blood of Christ: that salvation is not by the *merit* of works: and that there is nothing we are, or have, or do, which can, strictly speaking, *deserve* the least thing at God's hand.’

‘And all this is no more than to say, take the word *merit* in a *strict* sense, and I utterly renounce it: take it in a *looser* sense, and though I never use it, (I mean, I never ascribe it to any man) yet I do not condemn it. Therefore with regard to the word *merit*, I do not contradict myself at all.’

“You never use the word!” says Mr. Hill. “What have we then been disputing about?” (p. 36.) Why about a straw: namely, Whether there be a sense in which others may use that word without blame.

But can Mr. Hill, or any one living, suppose me to mean, I do not use the word in the present question?

What Mr. Hill adds, is a mere play upon words. “Does Mr. W by this *looser merit*, mean a merit that does not “*merit*?” Yes. By terming a work *meritorious* in this *improper* sense, I do not mean, that it *merits* or *deserves* a reward in the *proper* sense of the word. Instances of the word taken in this *improper* sense, occur all over the Bible.

“This is shamefully evasive.” No more than it is Greek. It is a plain, rational, solid distinction: and it holds with regard to numberless words in all languages, which may be taken either in a *proper* or *improper* sense.

When I say, 'I do not grant, that works are *meritorious*, even when accompanied by faith,' I take that word in a *proper* sense. But others take it in an *improper*, as nearly equivalent with *rewardable*. Here therefore I no more contradict Mr. Fletcher, than I do myself. Least of all do I plead, as Mr. Hill roundly affirms, "for justification by the *merit* of my own good works." (p. 52.)

X.

Of MARRIAGE. (p. 39.)

34. "Mr. W says, his thoughts on a single life are just the same they have been these thirty years." (I mean with regard to the advantages which attend that state in general.) "Why then did he marry?" I answered short, 'For reasons best known to himself.' As much as to say, I judge it extremely impertinent, for any but a superior to ask me the question. So the harmless raillery which Mr. Hill pleases himself with upon the occasion, may stand just as it is.

XI.

Concerning DRESS. (p. 40.)

35. "Mr. W advises his followers to wear *nothing of a glaring colour*, nothing *made in the height of the fashion*, in order to increase *their reward*, and *brighten their crown in heaven*."

"Nevertheless in his letter to a Quaker, he says, 'To make it a point of conscience, to differ from others, as to the shape and colour of their apparel, is mere *superstition*.'"

"Yet he says, 'So I advise; but I do not make it a *point of conscience*.' It follows, that we are to increase our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven, by doing that which is mere *superstition*, and without acting from a *point of conscience*."

I shall say more on this head than I otherwise would, in order to show every impartial reader, by one instance in a thousand, the manner wherein Mr. H. continually distorts and murders my words.

In my advice to the people called Methodists,* I say, 'I would not advise you to imitate the people called Quakers, in those particularities of dress, which can answer no end, but to distinguish you from all other people. But I advise you to imitate them in plainness: 1. Let your apparel be cheap, not expensive: 2. Let it be grave, not gay or showy; not in the point of the fashion.'

'Would you have a farther rule? Then take one you may always carry in your bosom. *Do every thing with a single eye*, and this will direct you in every circumstance. Let a single intention to please God prescribe, both what clothing you shall buy, and the manner wherein it shall be made, and how you shall put on and wear it. In other words, let all you do in this respect, be so done, that you may offer it to God, a sacrifice acceptable through Jesus Christ: so that consequently it may increase your reward, and brighten your crown in heaven.'

Now is there any thing ridiculous in all this? I would appeal even to a rational deist, whether it be not, upon the Christian scheme, all agreeable to the highest reason?

36. "But it is inconsistent with what you said elsewhere, to make it a point of conscience, to differ from others, as the Quakers do, in the shape or colour of their apparel, is mere superstition."

Not inconsistent at all. It is mere superstition to make wearing a broad-brimmed hat, or a coat with four buttons, (the very thing I referred to in the preceding page,) a point of conscience, that is, a thing necessary to salvation.

Why then, says Mr. Hill, "we are to increase our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven, by doing what is *mere superstition*, and without acting from a *point of conscience*!"

Was ever such twisting of words? Has he not great reason to cry out, "O rare *Logica Wesleiensis!* *Qui bene distinguit, bene docet!*!" I bless God, I can distinguish reason from sophistry; unkind, unjust, ungenteel sophistry, used purely for this good end, to asperse, to blacken a fellow Christian—because he is not a Calvinist!

No, Sir: What I call superstition, and no point of conscience, is wearing a Quaker hat or coat; which is widely different from the plainness of dress that I recommend to the people called Methodists. My *logic* therefore stands unimpeached; I wish your *candour* did so too. I would engage to answer every objection of Mr. Hill's, as fairly and fully as this. But I cannot spare so much time, I am called to other employment. And I should really think, Mr. Hill might spend his time better, than in throwing dirt at his quiet neighbours.

XII.

Of TEA. (p. 41.)

37. "Mr. W published a tract against drinking tea, and told the tea-drinkers, he would set them an example in that piece of self-denial."

"I did set them an example for twelve years. Then at the close of a consumption, by Dr. Fothergill's direction, I used it again."

"Why then did Mr. W republish this tract, making the world believe, it brought a paralytic disorder upon him?" Before I was twenty years old, it made my hand shake, so that I could hardly write. "Is it not strange then, that Dr. Fothergill should advise Mr. W to use what had before thrown him into the *palsy*?" I did not say so: I never had the palsy yet; though my hand shook, which is a *paralytic disorder*. But be it strange or not, so Dr. F advised; if you believe not *me*, you may inquire of himself. The low wit that follows, I do not meddle with: I leave it with the gentle reader.

XIII.

Of BAPTISM. (p. 42.)

38. Mr. W says, 'As there is no clear proof for *dipping* in Scripture, so there is very probable proof to the contrary.'

"Why then did you at Savannah baptize all children by immersion, *unless the parents certified that they were weak?*" I answered,

Not because I had any scruple, but in obedience to the rubric.'

Mr. Hill, according to custom, repeats the objection, without taking the least notice of the answer.

As to the story of half drowning Mrs. L. S., let her aver it to my face, and I shall say more. Only observe, Mr. Toplady, is not "my friend." He is all *your own*; your friend, ally, and fellow-soldier :

*Ut non
Compositi melius cum Bytho Bacchius!*

You are in truth, *Duo fulmina belli*. It is not strange, if their thunder should quite drown the sound of my "poor pop-guns."

39. "But what surpasses every thing else is, that Mr. W cannot even speak of his contradictions, without contradicting himself. For he absolutely denies, not only that he ever was unsettled in his principles, but that he was ever accused of being so, *either by friends or foes*." (p. 38, 39.) *Either by friends or foes!* I will rest the whole cause upon this. If this be true, I am out of my wits. If it be false, what is Mr. Hill? An honest, upright, sensible man; but a little too warm, and therefore not seeing so clearly in this as in other things.

My words are, 'My friends have oftener accused me of being too stiff in my opinions, than too flexible. My enemies have accused me of both, and of every thing besides.' (Rem. p. 39.) Is this "denying that ever I was accused of inconsistency *either by friends or foes*?"

I do still deny, that Mr. Delamotte spoke to me, "of my wavering, unsettled disposition." (p. 43.) But "he spoke to you," says Mr. Hill, "*of something else!*" It is very likely he might.

40. Mr. W is equally self-inconsistent "with regard to the Mystics. These he tells us he had *once in great veneration*." (p. 14.) (I had two or three and forty years ago,) "as the *best explainers of the gospel of Christ*. Yet afterwards he declares he *looks upon them as one great Antichrist*." I did look upon them as such thirty years ago. But in my Remarks I say, 'I retract this. It is far too strong.' But observe, I never contradicted it till now. But how does this agree with Mr. W's saying, "I never was in the way of mysticism at all?"

Perfectly well: I admired the mystic writers. But I never *was in their way*; leaving off the outward means.

"But why did Mr. W let the expression stand, *Solomon is the chief of the mystics?*" Perhaps because I thought it a harmless one, and capable of a good meaning. But I observe again: Mr. H. takes it for granted, that I have the correction of Mr. Fletcher's books. This is a mistake; of some I have; of others I have not.

41. Now comes the capital instance of self-inconsistency "In 1770, Mr. W esteems the Minutes the standard of orthodoxy. In 1771, he signs a paper, owning them to be *unguarded*. In 1772, he tells us, he does not know but it would have been better, not to have signed that paper at all!" (p. 13.) Suppose all this true,

what will it prove? Only that I made a concession which was made an ill use of.

But "Mr. F.'s defence makes poor Mr. W appear more and more inconsistent. Mr. W declares the Minutes to be *unguarded*:" (that is *not enough guarded* against cavillers:) "Mr. F defends them, and strives to reconcile them with the Declaration. But then comes Mr. W and tells us, he does not know, but it had been better not to have signed it at all." And what then? Why, "hereby he intimates, that he has fixed a different sense upon the Minutes from that which they originally bore." No such thing; he intimates this and no more, that by that well-intended concession, he had given occasion to those who sought occasion of offence against him. So all this laboured charge vanishes into air, and no more proves inconsistency than high-treason.

42. We come now to the main point, *Perfection*; the objections to which spread almost throughout the book. But the question is not, Whether the doctrine be true or false? But whether I contradict myself concerning it?

As to what occurs in the fourth and fifth pages it may, therefore, suffice to say, I do believe (as you observe) that *real Christians*, (meaning those that are *perfected in love*,) are freed from *evil or sinful thoughts*. And where do I contradict this?

P. 10, "You say, I cannot prove the facts alleged against some professors of perfection. Indeed I can." If you could, that would not prove that I contradict myself on this head.

"But one at W——r writes, 'I send you an account of two or three shocking instances of bad behaviour among the professors of perfection here.' Perhaps so. But will that prove my inconsistency?

43. Awhile since Mr. Ma——d related to me the whole story of Samuel Wi——n. I know not that I ever heard it before, but only some imperfect fragments of it. The other story, of "one who said, the Holy Ghost visibly descendeth on all true converts," may be true for aught I know, but I question much, whether that madman was a preacher? It may likewise be true, that several wild expressions were uttered at West-street Chapel. Yet I think, all these put together will not prove, that I contradict myself.

However, I am glad to read, "If I publish another edition of the *Review*, these instances shall all be omitted: and *personal vilifications* shall be left to the sole pen of Mr. W" Then you will reduce your *Farrago* to a page, and your *Review* to a penny pamphlet. But still *personal vilification* will not suit my pen. I have better employment for it.

44. You say, p. 23, "Let us now proceed to Mr. W.'s assertions on sinless perfection."

As I observed before, I am not now to dispute Whether they are right or wrong? I keep, therefore, to that single point, Do I herein contradict myself, or not?

When I said, 'If some of our hymns contradict others,' I did not

allow, they do. I meant only, if it were so, this would not prove, that I contradict myself. "But still it proves, the people must sing contradictions." Observe; that is, If—

In your account of perfection, blot out *No wandering thoughts*. None in the body are exempt from these. This we have declared over and over; particularly in the sermon written upon that subject.

If in the sermon on Eph. ii. 8, (not xi. 5. as your blunderer prints it,) the words which I had struck out in the preceding edition, are inserted again, what will this prove? Only that the printer, in my absence, printed, not from the last, but from an uncorrected copy. However, you are hereby excused from unfairness, as to that quotation. But what excuse have you in the other instance, with regard to Enoch and Elijah? On which I asked, 'Why is Mr. Hill so careful to name the first edition? Because in the second the mistake is corrected. Did he know this? And could he avail himself of a mistake which he *knew* was removed before he wrote?' (Rem. p. 29.)

It is now plain he *could*! Nay, instead of owning his unfairness, he endeavours to turn the blame upon me! "You are as inconsistent in your censures as in your doctrines: you blame me for quoting the last edition of your sermon; whereas you call me to account for quoting the *first* edition of your notes, concerning Enoch and Elijah: each of whom you have proved, by a peculiar rule of *Foundry-Logic*, to be both in heaven and out of heaven." So without any remorse, nay, being so totally unconcerned as even to break jests on the occasion, you again 'avail yourself of a mistake which you knew was removed before you wrote!'

45. But Mr. W "hath both *struck out* some words, and "put in others, into the sermon."—This is a common complaint with Mr Hill; on which therefore it is needful to explain.

I generally abridge what I answer; which cannot be done without *striking out* all unessential words. And I generally *put in* to quotations from my own writings, such words as I judge will prevent mistakes.

Now to the contradictions.

'If we say we have no sin *now remaining*, (I mean, after we are justified,) we deceive ourselves.'

I believe this: and yet I believe

Sin shall not always in our flesh remain?

Again, 'Many *infirmities* do remain.'

This I believe: and I believe also

'He that is born of God, (and *keepeth himself*, 1 John v. 18,) *sinneth not by infirmities*, whether in act, word, or thought.'

I believe, likewise, that in those perfected in love,

*'No wrinkle of infirmity,
No spot of sin remains.'*

My brother, at the bottom of the page, expressly says, 'No *sinful infirmity*.' So whether this be scriptural or not, here is no contradiction.

I have spoken so largely already concerning sins of *surprise* and

infirmity, that it is quite needless to add any more. I need only refer to the *Remarks*, at the 34th and following pages.

46. But to go on.

‘I wrestle not now.’

This is an expression of my brother’s, which I do not subscribe to.

‘We wrestle not with flesh and blood.’

“This he allows to be his own.” (p. 31.)

Indeed I do not: although it is true, ‘the *perpetual war* which I speak of in the note on Eph. vi. 13, is *a war with principalities and powers, but not with flesh and blood.*’ “But either way Mr. John is stuck fast in the mire. For in his *Remarks* he contradicts his brother: in his *Annotations* he contradicts himself: and in his *Hymn* he contradicts both his brother and himself.”

Mr. John is not quite *stuck fast* yet: for this is a mistake from beginning to end. 1. I do not contradict my brother in my *Remarks*. In saying, ‘I do not subscribe to that expression,’ I mean, I do not make it my own; I do not undertake to defend it. Yet neither do I enter the lists against it: it is capable of a sound meaning. 2. I do not contradict myself in the *note*; let him prove it that can. 3. I contradict nobody in the *hymn*; for it is not mine.

Again. ‘I never said, While one *evil thought* can rise, I am not *born again*. My brother said so once: but he took the words in too high a sense.’ I add, and in a sense not warrantable by the Bible. And yet I believe, that ‘*real Christians*, I mean those perfected in love, are freed from evil or *sinful thoughts*.’

“But is not a babe in Christ, *born again*? Is he not a *real Christian*?” He is doubtless born again; and in some sense he is a real Christian: but not in the sense above defined.

47 We come now to the additional contradictions which Mr. Hill undertakes to find in my writings. They are already dwindled into one: and I hope to show quickly, this one is none at all.—It stands thus.

‘Most express are the words of St. John, *We know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not.* Indeed it is said, this means only, he doth not commit sin *wilfully or habitually.*’ (Observe. I do not deny the text to mean this; But I deny that it means *this only*.)

As a contradiction to this, Mr. Hill places these words in the opposite column.

‘The apostle John declares, whosoever is born of God sinneth not, 1. By any habitual sin; nor, 2. By any ‘*wilful sin*.’ True; but do I say, the apostle means *this only*? Otherwise here is no contradiction. So although you have got the gallows ready, you have not turned off *old Mordecai* yet. As you so frequently give me that appellation, I, for once, accept of your favour.

48. “Before I quit this subject” (of perfection,) “I cannot help expressing my astonishment, that Mr. W should deny that his tenets on that point exactly harmonize with those of the popish church; since all the decrees and books that have been published by the Roman clergy, prove this matter beyond a doubt.”

I believe, you have been told so. But you should not assert it, unless from personal knowledge. "Alexander Ross says so." What is Alexander Ross? See with your own eyes. "Mr. Hervey too gives an account of Lindenus and Andradius." *Second-hand evidence* still. Have you seen them yourself? Otherwise you ought not to allow their testimony. "As to that most excellent and evangelical work," as you term it, the eleven letters ascribed to Mr. Hervey, Mr. Sellon has abundantly shown, that they are most excellently virulent, scurrilous, and abusive; and full as far from the evangelic spirit, as the Koran of Mahomet.

"But Bishop Cowper"—I object to him, beside his being a *hot, bitter* Calvinist, that he is a dull, heavy, shallow writer. And let him be what he may, all you cite from him is second-hand authority.—"Nay, I refer to the bishop's own words. But still you have only the words at second-hand. In order to know the tenets of the church of Rome, you must read the Romish authors themselves. Nay, it does not suffice to read their own private authors. They will disown any thing we charge them with, unless we can prove it, by recurring to their public and authentic records. Such are the *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini*. Such the *Catechisms ad Parochos*. Till you have read these at least, you should never undertake to determine what is, or what is not popery.

49. "But as I am now on the subject of popery, I must make a few animadversions on what Mr. W affirms, 'I always thought the tenets of the church of Rome, were nearer by half to Mr. Hill's tenets, than to Mr. W's.'" (p. 33.) Nay, give the honour of this to its true author; Mr. H. goes to consult a Popish friar at Paris, a Benedictine Monk, one Father Walsh, concerning the Minutes of the Conference. Father W (Mr. H. says; and I see no reason to scruple his authority here;) assures him, that the Minutes contain false doctrine: and that the tenets of the church of Rome are nearer by half to his (Mr. Hill's) tenets than they are to Mr. W's. (So Mr. Hill himself informs the world, in the Paris Conversation of famous memory: which I really think, he would never have published, unless as the vulgar say, the Devil had owed him a shame.) I add, 'Truly I always thought so.' But I am the more confirmed therein, by the authority of so competent a judge: especially when his judgment is publicly delivered by so unexceptionable a witness.

50. Nay, but "you know the principles of the Pope and of John Calvin, are quite opposite to each other." I do not know, that they are opposite at all in this point. Many Popes have been either Dominicans or Benedictines. And many of the Benedictines, with all the Dominicans, are as firm Predestinarians as Calvin himself. Whether the present Pope is a Dominican, I cannot tell: If he is, he is far nearer your tenets than mine.

Let us make the trial with regard to your ten propositions.

1. "You deny election.

So does the Pope of Rome." | I know not that. Probably he holds it.

3. "You deny *perseverance*.
 3. You deny *imputed righteousness*.
 4. "You hold *free-will*. So does the Pope of Rome." No, not as I do, (unless he is a Predestinarian: otherwise) he ascribes it to *nature*, I to *grace*.
 5. "You hold, that works are a condition of justification.
 6. "You hold a *two-fold justification*, one now, another at the last day.
 7. "You hold the doctrine of *merit*.
 8. "You hold *sinless perfection*.
 9. "You hold, that *sins* are only *infirmities*.
 10. "You distinguish between *venial* and *mortal sins*."

So does the Pope of Rome." That is much to be doubted. Perhaps the Pope of Rome does: but I assert it continually.

4. "You hold *free-will*. So does the Pope of Rome." No, not as I do, (unless he is a Predestinarian: otherwise) he ascribes it to *nature*, I to *grace*.

5. "You hold, that works are a condition of justification.

6. "You hold a *two-fold justification*, one now, another at the last day.

7. "You hold the doctrine of *merit*.

8. "You hold *sinless perfection*.

9. "You hold, that *sins* are only *infirmities*.

10. "You distinguish between *venial* and *mortal sins*."

If you mean *good works*, I do not.

So does the Pope of Rome?" And so do all Protestants, if they believe the Bible.

I do not. Neither does the Pope, if father Walsh says true.

So does the Pope." I deny that. How do you prove it?

I hold no such thing. And you know it well.

Not so; I abhor the distinction

Now let every man of understanding judge, whether father Walsh did not speak the very truth?

51. "This pamphlet was finished, when I was told, that Mr. W had lately a very remarkable dream, which awakened him out of a sound sleep. This dream he communicated to his society. It was in substance as follows. A big, rough man came to him, and gave him a violent blow on the arm with a redhot iron." (p. 51.)

"Now the interpretation thereof I conceive to be as follows:

1. "The *big, rough man*, is Mr. Hill:
2. "The *bar of iron* (redhot) is *Logica Wesleiensis*:
3. "The *blow* denotes the *shock* which Mr. John will receive by the said pamphlet:

4. "His being *awakened out of a sound sleep*, signifies there is yet hope, that he will some time or other come to the right use of his spiritual faculties."

Pretty and well devised! And though it is true I never had any such dream since I was born, yet I am obliged to the inventor of it; and that on many accounts.

I am obliged to him, 1. For sending against me only a *big, rough man*: it might have been a lion, or a bear: 2. For directing the *bar of iron* only to my arm; it might have been, my poor scull: 3. For letting the *big man* give me only *one blow*; had it been repeated, I had been slain outright: and, 4. For hoping I shall, some time or other, come to the right use of my spiritual faculties.

52. Perhaps Mr. Hill may expect, that I should make him some return for the favour of his heroic poem. But

"Certes I have, for many days
 Sent my poetic herd to graze."

And had I not, I should have been utterly unable to present him with a parallel. Yet upon reflection, I believe I can, although I own, it is rather of the lyric, than the heroic kind. And because possibly he may be inclined to write notes on this too, I will tell him the origin of it. One Sunday, immediately after sermon, my father's clerk said, with an audible voice, "Let us sing to the praise and glory of God, a hymn of mine own composing." It was short and sweet, and ran thus:

" King William is come home, come home :
King William home is come !
Therefore let us together sing
The hymn that's call'd Te D'um !"

53. Before I conclude, I beg leave, in my turn, to give you a few advices.

And, 1. *Be calm.* Do not venture into the field again, till you are master of your temper. You know, *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness*, neither promotes the truth, *of God*.

2. *Be good-natured.* Passion is not commendable ; but *ill-nature* still less. Even irrational anger is more excusable than *bitterness*, less offensive to God and man.

3. *Be courteous.* Show good manners as well as good-nature to your opponent of whatever kind. "But he is rude." You need not be so too. If you regard not him, "Reverence yourself."

Absolutely contrary to this, is the crying out at every turn, "Quirk, sophistry, evasion !" In controversy these exclamations go for nothing. This is neither better nor worse than *calling names*.

4. *Be merciful.* When you have gained an advantage over your opponent, do not press it to the uttermost. Remember the honest Quaker's advice to his friend a few years ago, "Art thou not content to lay John Wesley upon his back, but thou wilt tread his guts out ?"

5. In writing, do not consider yourself as a *man of fortune*, or take any liberty with others on that account. These distinctions weigh little more in the literary world, than in the world of spirits. Men of sense simply consider what is written : not whether the writer be a lord or a cobbler ?

Lastly, Remember, *For every idle word men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment.* Remember, *by thy words shalt thou be justified ; or by thy words shalt thou be condemned !*

BRISTOL, March 14, 1773.

A LETTER

TO

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

1. YOU have heard ten thousand stories of us who are commonly called Protestants, of which, if you believe only one in a thousand, you must think very hardly of us. But this is quite contrary to our Lord's rule, *Judge not; that ye be not judged*; and has many ill consequences, particularly this, It inclines us to think as hardly of you. Hence we are on both sides less willing to help one another, and more ready to hurt each other. Hence brotherly love is utterly destroyed: and each side looking on the other as monsters, gives way to anger, hatred, malice, to every unkind affection, which have frequently broke out in such inhuman barbarities, as are scarce named among the Heathens.

2. Now can nothing be done, even allowing us on both sides to retain our own opinions, for the softening our hearts towards each other, the giving a check to this flood of unkindness, and restoring at least some small degree of love among our neighbours and countrymen? Do not you wish for this? Are you not fully convinced, that malice, hatred, revenge, bitterness, whether in us or in you, in our hearts or yours, are an abomination to the Lord? Be our opinions right or be they wrong, these tempers are undeniably wrong. They are the broad road that leads to destruction, to the nethermost hell.

3. I do not suppose all the bitterness is on your side. I know there is too much on our side also. So much that I fear many Protestants (so called) will be angry at me too, for writing to you in this manner; and will say, "It is showing you too much favour; you deserve no such treatment at our hands."

4. But I think you do. I think you deserve the tenderest regard I can show, were it only because the same God hath raised you and me from the dust of the earth, and has made us both capable of loving and enjoying him to eternity: were it only because the Son of God has bought you and me with his own blood. How much more, if you are a person fearing God, (as without question many of you are,) and studying to have a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man?

5. I shall therefore endeavour, as mildly and inoffensively as I can, to remove in some measure the ground of your unkindness, by plainly declaring what our belief, and what our practice are: that

you may see, we are not altogether such monsters as perhaps you imagined us to be.

A true Protestant may express his belief in these, or the like words.

6. As I am assured, that there is an infinite and independent Being, and that it is impossible there should be more than One; so I believe, that this One God is the Father of all things, especially of angels and men: That he is, in a peculiar manner, the Father of those whom he regenerates by his Spirit, whom he adopts in his Son, as co-heirs with him, and crowns with an eternal inheritance: but in a still higher sense, the Father of his only Son, whom he hath begotten from eternity.

I believe this Father of All, not only to be able to do whatsoever pleaseth him, but also to have an eternal right of making what, and when, and how he pleaseth, and of possessing and disposing of all that he has made: and that he of his own goodness created heaven and earth, and all that is therein.

7. I believe that Jesus of Nazareth was the Saviour of the world, the Messiah so long foretold: That being anointed with the Holy Ghost, he was a Prophet, revealing to us the whole will of God: That he was a Priest, who gave himself a sacrifice for sin, and still makes intercession for transgressors: That he is a King, who has power in heaven and in earth, and will reign till he has subdued all things to himself.

I believe, he is the proper, natural Son of God, God of God, very God of very God: And that he is the Lord of All, having absolute, supreme, universal dominion over all things: but more peculiarly our Lord, who believe in him, both by conquest, purchase, and voluntary obligation.

I believe, that he was made man, joining the human nature with the divine in one person: being conceived by the singular operation of the Holy Ghost, and born of the blessed Virgin Mary, who as well after as before she brought him forth, continued a pure and unspotted Virgin.

I believe, he suffered inexpressible pains both of body and soul, and at last death, even the death of the cross, at the time that Pontius Pilate governed Judea, under the Roman emperor: that his body was then laid in the grave, and his soul went to the place of separate spirits: That the third day he rose again from the dead: That he ascended into heaven; where he remains in the midst of the throne of God, in the highest power and glory, as Mediator till the end of the world, as God to all eternity: That in the end, he will come down from heaven, to judge every man according to his works, both those who shall be then alive, and all who have died before that day.

8. I believe the Infinite and Eternal Spirit of God, equal with the Father and the Son, to be not only perfectly holy in himself, but the immediate cause of all holiness in us; enlightening our understandings, rectifying our wills and affections, renewing our natures, uniting

our persons to Christ, assuring us of the adoption of sons, leading us in our actions, purifying and sanctifying our souls and bodies, to a full and eternal enjoyment of God.

9. I believe, that Christ and his apostles gathered unto himself a church, to which he has continually added such as shall be saved : That this Catholic, that is, Universal Church, extending to all nations and all ages, is holy in all its members, who have fellowship with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost : That they have fellowship with the holy angels, who constantly minister to these heirs of salvation : And with all the living members of Christ on earth, as well as all who are departed in his faith and fear.

10. I believe God forgives all the sins of them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel ; and that at the last day, all men shall rise again, every one with his own body.

I believe, that as the unjust shall after their resurrection be tormented in hell for ever, so the just shall enjoy inconceivable happiness in the presence of God to all eternity.

11. Now, is there any thing wrong in this ? Is there any one point which you do not believe as well as we ?

But you think we ought to believe more. We will not now enter into the dispute. Only let me ask, If a man sincerely believes thus much, and practises accordingly, can any one possibly persuade you to think, that such a man shall perish everlastinglly ?

“ But does he practise accordingly ? ” If he does not, we grant all his faith will not save him. And this leads me to show you in few and plain words, what the practice of a true Protestant is.

I say, a true Protestant : for I disclaim all common swearers, sabbath-breakers, drunkards ; all whoremongers, liars, cheats, extortioners ; in a word, all that live in open sin. These are no Protestants : they are no Christians at all. Give them their own name : they are open Heathens. They are the curse of the nation, the bane of society, the shame of mankind, the scum of the earth.

13. A true Protestant believes in God, has a full confidence in his mercy, fears him with a filial fear, and loves him with all his soul. He worships God in spirit and in truth, in every thing gives him thanks : calls upon him with his heart as well as his lips, at all times and in all places ; honours his holy name and his word, and serves him truly all the days of his life.

Now, do not you yourself approve of this ? Is there any one point you can condemn ? Do not you practise, as well as approve of it ? Can you ever be happy if you do not ? Can you ever expect true peace in this, or glory in the world to come, if you do not believe in God through Christ, if you do not thus fear and love God ? My dear friend, consider, I am not persuading you to leave or change your religion, but to follow after that fear and love of God, without which all religion is vain. I say not a word to you about your opinions or outward manner of worship. But I say all worship is an abomination to the Lord, unless you worship him in spirit and in truth, with your heart as well as your lips, with your spirit and

with your understanding also. Be your form of worship what it will, but in every thing give him thanks ; else it is all but lost labour. Use whatever outward observances you please, but put your whole trust in him : but honour his holy name and his word, and serve him truly all the days of your life.

14. Again. A true Protestant loves his neighbour, that is, every man, friend or enemy, good or bad, as himself, as he loves his own soul, as Christ loved us. And as Christ laid down his life for us, so is he ready to lay down his life for his brethren. He shows this love by doing to all men in all points as he would they should do unto him. He loves, honours, and obeys his father and mother, and helps them to the uttermost of his power. He honours and obeys the king, and all that are put in authority under him. He cheerfully submits to all his governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters. He behaves lowly and reverently to all his betters. He hurts no body by word or deed. He is true and just in all his dealings. He bears no malice or hatred in his heart. He abstains from all evil speaking, lying, and slandering, neither is guile found in his mouth. Knowing his body to be the temple of the Holy Ghost, he keeps it in sobriety, temperance, and chastity. He does not desire other men's goods, but is content with that he hath, labours to get his own living, and to do the whole will of God in that state of life unto which it has pleased God to call him.

15. Have you any thing to reprove in this ? Are you not herein even as he ? If not, (tell the truth,) are you not condemned, both by God and your own conscience ? Can you fall short of any one point hereof, without falling short of being a Christian ?

Come, my brother, and let us reason together. Are you right if you only love your friend, and hate your enemy ? Do not even the Heathens and Publicans so ? You are called to love your enemies, to bless them that curse you, and to pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you. But are you not disobedient to the heavenly calling ? Does your tender love to all men, not only the good, but also the evil and unthankful, approve you the child of your Father which is in heaven ? Otherwise whatever you believe, and whatever you practise, you are of your father the Devil. Are you ready to lay down your life for your brethren ? And do you do unto all as you would they should do unto you ? If not, do not deceive your own soul. You are but a Heathen still. Do you love, honour, and obey your father and mother, and help them to the utmost of your power ? Do you honour and obey all in authority ? All your governors, spiritual pastors and masters ? Do you behave yourself lowly and reverently to all your betters ? Do you hurt no body by word or deed ? Are you true and just in all your dealings ? Do you take care to pay whatever you owe ? Do you feel no malice, or envy, or revenge, no hatred or bitterness to any man ? If you do, it is plain, you are not of God ; for all these are the tempers of the Devil. Do you speak the truth from your heart to all men, and that in tenderness and love ? Are you an Israelite indeed, in whom is no

guile ? Do you keep your body in sobriety, temperance, and chastity, as knowing it is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and that if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy ? Have you learned in every state wherein you are, therewith to be content ? Do you labour to get your own living, abhorring idleness as you abhor hell-fire ? The Devil tempts other men ; but an idle man tempts the Devil. An idle man's brain is the Devil's shop, where he is continually working mischief. Are you not slothful in business ? Whatever your hand finds to do, do you do it with your might ? And do you do all as unto the Lord, as a sacrifice unto God, acceptable in Christ Jesus ?

This, and this alone, is the old religion. This is true, primitive Christianity. O when shall it spread over all the earth ? When shall it be found both in us and you ? Without waiting for others, let each of us, by the grace of God, amend one.

16. Are we not thus far agreed ? Let us thank God for this, and receive it as a fresh token of his love. But if God still loveth us, we ought also to love one another. We ought, without this endless jangling about opinions, to provoke one another to love and to good works. Let the points wherein we differ stand aside ; here are enough wherein we agree, enough to be the ground of every Christian temper, and of every Christian action.

O brethren, let us not still fall out by the way. I hope to see *you* in heaven. And if I practise the religion above described, you dare not say I shall go to hell. You cannot think so. None can persuade you to it. Your own conscience tells you the contrary. Then if we cannot as yet *think alike* in all things, at least we may *love alike*. Herein we cannot possibly do amiss. For of one point none can doubt a moment, God is love ; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.

17. In the name then, and in the strength of God, let us resolve, first, not to hurt one another : to do nothing unkind or unfriendly to each other, nothing which we would not have done to ourselves. Rather let us endeavour after every instance of a kind, friendly, and Christian behaviour towards each other.

Let us resolve, secondly, God being our helper, to speak nothing harsh or unkind of each other. The sure way to avoid this, is to say all the good we can, both of and to one another : in all our conversation, either with, or concerning each other, to use only the language of love : to speak with all softness and tenderness ; with the most endearing expressions, which is consistent with truth and sincerity.

Let us, thirdly, resolve to harbour no unkind thought, no unfriendly temper towards each other. Let us lay the axe to the root of the tree ; let us examine all that rises in our hearts, and suffer no disposition there which is contrary to tender affection. Then shall we easily refrain from unkind actions and words, when the very root of bitterness is cut up.

Let us, fourthly, endeavour to help each other on in whatever we

are agreed leads to the kingdom. So far as we can, let us always rejoice to strengthen each other's hands in God. Above all, let us each take heed to himself (since each must give an account of himself to God) that he fall not short of the religion of love; that he be not condemned in that he himself approveth. O let you and I (whatever others do,) press on to the prize of our high calling: that being justified by faith we may have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: that we may rejoice in God through Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the atonement: that the love of God may be shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Let us count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord; being ready for him to suffer the loss of all things, and counting them but dung, that we may win Christ.

I am, your affectionate servant, for Christ's sake,

DUBLIN, *July 18, 1749.*

END OF THE NINTH VOLUME.

